

© PETER GRIFFITHS

**FIRST PUBLISHED 1966
BY LESLIE FREWIN PUBLISHERS LIMITED
15 HAY'S MEWS, BERKELEY SQUARE, LONDON W1**

**PRINTED BY ANCHOR PRESS AND
BOUND BY WILLIAM BRENDON
BOTH OF TIPTREE, ESSEX**

WORLD RIGHTS RESERVED

'I will sit down now,
but the time will come
when you will hear me.'

DISRAELI
House of Commons
7th December, 1837

Contents

List of Tables	7
Preface	9
The Emergence of Coloured Races	11
The Peoples of Britain	26
The Colour Problem Abroad	42
Immigration – a Vital Political Issue	85
Smethwick – and that Election	152
The Dilemma of the Future	180
Conclusion	225
Bibliography	229
Index	233

List of Tables

I	Estimated Net Commonwealth Immigration, 1955-62	38
II	Commonwealth Immigration, July-December 1962	39
III	Commonwealth Immigration, 1963-4	40
IV	Convictions of Commonwealth Citizens, 1962-3	96
V	Aid to Commonwealth Countries, 1963-4	222
VI	Aid to Commonwealth Dependencies, 1963-4	223

Preface

BRITAIN has a racial problem. There are more than a million coloured immigrants living in the industrial areas of this country. They create enormous new social problems in the fields of housing, education, public health and personal relations in districts which already have their social services overburdened and undermanned. To those living in rural areas, market towns or mining villages the immigrant problem may seem remote. So does the problem of race-relations appear remote to the Americans in New England or the agricultural Middle West but no one would deny that the United States has a racial problem.

If we ignore the situation then we, too, will have our Harlems and our Alabamas. This situation is developing daily. The Smethwick General Election of 1964 shows clearly just how deeply a community can be disturbed by a mass influx of newcomers from overseas. It also showed how strongly passions can be aroused over this emotional problem. Charges and counter-charges serve no useful purpose. What is needed is a concise statement of the facts underlying Britain's racial conflict. There is a demand for an objective, forthright examination of race-relations at home and abroad. This book aims to give the facts. It traces the broad history of race-relations and it examines the racial problems of the world today. Most of all it is a warning to the British people to heed the omens of disaster before it is too late. It is too much to hope that the ideas expressed will find unanimous support but if they provide a context for discussion on a rational, unemotional plane then this book will have served its purpose.

I dedicate this volume to the many thousands of British people who have shown kindness, consideration and understanding

PREFACE

when faced with an emerging racial problem. Their fortitude, patience and restraint have kept our national life free from the bitterness which has marked that of other multi-racial societies. It is to seek understanding for their point of view and national support for their legitimate aspirations that this book is written.

PETER GRIFFITHS, MP

March 1966

The Emergence of Coloured Races

FROM the dawn of history man has been suspicious of outsiders. Resources have always been scarce and the fear of having to give up the ownership of territory, goods or way of life has led to conflict. Primitive tribes regarded, and still regard, all strangers as outsiders. Little attempt is made to differentiate between individuals or groups of foreigners. All are regarded as potential enemies to be driven away.

When settled communities developed there were soon clearly defined boundaries established to mark off the territory of each family group and of each village. The setting up of principalities and kingdoms made these boundaries more rigid and soon encompassed all the available territory which could be held by force of arms. Nomadic tribes found themselves excluded from pastures and tribal wars were endemic. The Old Testament gives a clear picture of a nomadic tribe seizing pasture by force, living in a state of continuous conflict with other more sedentary tribes, making short-lived alliances for defence or attack, being carried off as slaves by powerful neighbours and finally being incorporated into a vast empire.

Once nation states had developed, quarrelsome tribes were more or less united into larger communities. These could be vast in size such as the early Chinese empires or tiny like the Greek city states. There are few records surviving from this early period but none of them record any discrimination on grounds of colour. All strangers were viewed with equal suspicion regardless of their colour.

Where empires were established by conquest the defeated nations became the servants of the victors but the relationship

was based on the strength of arms and not on racial origin. The early empires of Egypt, Babylon, Nineveh and Persia were cosmopolitan in nature. Members of conquered races were held in bondage but the stories of Joseph and Daniel in the Old Testament indicate that there was room for what is now called 'social mobility' and that no doctrine of a 'master race' had emerged.

The Roman Empire was made up of many peoples. Most of these were white in Europe or brown in the Near and Middle East. The Romans regarded themselves as natural masters but a Negro sat on the Imperial throne. In fact, Roman observers regarded the Ethiopians as considerably more civilised and agreeable than the Germanic and Slav tribes against whom the Eastern frontier had to be defended! However, the Eastern barbarians were in their turn accepted as soldiers and later even as rulers of the Empire.

The Romans were in touch with Asia and Africa and clearly recognised the three broad divisions of mankind – Caucasian, Mongoloid and Negroid – but no attempt was made to establish any order of superiority. Status was based on military strength and economic power. Master and slave might be of any race.

Christianity, growing from humble beginnings in Palestine, spread throughout the Roman Empire. It was carried also into Ethiopia which had long been in religious and economic contact with the Mediterranean. Thus in its early days Caucasian and Negro were joined in one communion while other white and coloured races were regarded as pagans to be converted as opportunity arose. Christianity was the monopoly of no race.

The collapse of the Roman Empire, followed by the spread of Mohammedanism along the coast of North Africa, isolated Ethiopia and left Christianity basically as the religion of Europe. The final defeat and withdrawal of the Huns left Europe free of Mongoloid peoples but the threat from Asia remained for many centuries. The war in the East was basically political and territorial but had strongly developed religious undertones. A similar conflict in Spain against the Moors added to the feeling of a besieged Christendom. The attitude of the Christian Church that it was the

THE EMERGENCE OF COLOURED RACES

only true religion led to the regarding of outsiders as heathens. Since these outsiders were Mongoloid in the East and brown-skinned with a large admixture of negroid peoples in the South there grew up an accepted philosophy of white Christians defending civilisation. For the first time colour came to be regarded as a significant factor though no one would have claimed white superiority at this time. The Chinese and Arab empires were models of good government to chaotic feudal Europe.

At the same time a very specific form of racial feeling – anti-Semitism – developed. Whenever Christianity was in a militant mood there was a good chance that violence would be done to the scattered Jewish nation. Unschooled populations were easily inflamed against a relatively helpless minority. With the slogan ‘They crucified our Lord’ a pogrom was always easy to initiate, and almost every crusade was marked by a corresponding massacre of Jews. The idea that one people was different from all others regardless of individual variations had taken root.

Southern Europeans who were in close contact with Arabic civilisation were far less likely to hold views on the superiority of white people than North Europeans who had little or no link with the world. The Venetian traveller who visited Bagdad or Peking was hardly likely to imagine his home civilisation as superior to theirs. The illiterate Spanish peasant could not be expected to feel superior to his cultured Moorish overlord. However, the growing power of the North European nations led to an increasing belief in the superiority of white Christians.

The eclipse of the power of Venice and later of Spain and Portugal brought about a growth in the doctrine of white supremacy. Columbus and other Southern explorers spoke in glowing terms of other civilisations, but English, French and Dutch seamen showed little regard for anything except the value of the booty they could obtain by plunder. The slave trade, begun by the Spanish when the Indians of the Caribbean and South America proved unsuited to plantation work and mining, was taken over by the North European nations. This trade in black men and women further reduced the status of coloured people.

The view that the 'sons of Ham' were to be 'hewers of wood and drawers of water' was accepted as a natural law. Protestantism, with its suspicion of ease and comfort and its missionary zeal, grew its strongest roots in Northern Europe, the increasingly dominant political region. This was also a contributory factor to the debasement of the position of 'the heathen'.

Can the attitude of North Europeans, and in particular of Anglo-Saxons, to other races be explained in full by historical conditioning? Perhaps there is also something else stretching back to the dim past of Nordic culture. Long North European winter nights of blackness and fear were in contrast with the summer sunshine. Darkness and the colour black came to be associated with evil and death. Black devils were conjured up to meet black-robed witches. Black men, so rare as to be the object of travellers' tales, could easily be an object of fear to such peoples. Ancient fears remain part of popular folklore. The 'Black Peter' who attends St Nicholas in Holland at Christmas time is a devil figure transformed into a servant. It is a natural act to try to enslave that which we secretly fear.

At the same time it would be unfair to suggest that only North Europeans have ever accepted unfounded racial myths. Philip Mason in *Commonsense about Race* points out that to the Chinese all outsiders have always been regarded as barbarians. The Hindus speak of '*mlechhas*' in a term of abuse. In the *Arabian Nights* the Negro is regarded as an object of sexual fear and jealousy. Even so, no group has ever carried racial feeling to the extent that the North Europeans have done.

In the nineteenth century much discussion centred on the questions of racial superiority. Attempts were made to justify slavery by 'proving' the Negro's innate inferiority. Alongside this others tried to develop and propagate myths about the purity of races and the harm done by intermarriage. Although some eminent people took part in these efforts the results were pseudo-scientific only and modern research under carefully controlled conditions shows that individuals within a racial group vary far more greatly in mental and physical ability than do members of

THE EMERGENCE OF COLOURED RACES

different races who have had similar background environments. Historians have exploded the myths of 'pure' races. We are all of mixed race and the generalisations which we use when we speak of races are merely for convenience. The Negro is not of one race but a mixture of races. So is the Caucasian and the Mongoloid. The Arab and Jew who face each other with hatred today are of similar Semitic origin. Blood transfusions of the correct blood group can be given to members of any race. Experience in Brazil and the West Indies has shown that the children of mixed marriages are fit and healthy and the marriage itself is likely to be more productive of offspring than the average for single-race marriages. Groups such as the Aborigines of Australia who had been cut off from other races for centuries were able to interbreed with the white settlers. The facts prove conclusively that any doctrine of racial superiority is completely unfounded.

The Nazi doctrine of the superiority of the Nordic race was the last spasm of a completely demolished proposition. Scientific facts will make it quite impossible for educated people to hold such ideas in the future. Only among the illiterate or semi-literate can such doctrines find acceptance unless prejudice blinds people into rejecting what is clearly proven.

Since 1945 the great European empires have been rapidly dismantled. Now a majority of states who are members of the United Nations have coloured populations. More than two-thirds of the world's people are non-white. Any doctrine of white superiority is therefore to be rejected on political grounds as well as scientific evidence. Man is one species and it is essential that this is recognised if the threat of conflict is to be avoided. The vast problems facing the world are too terrible to be made worse by the irrelevancy of racial conflict. Since the end of World War II mankind has been seen as divided East versus West. On the one hand the great and growing power of the Soviet Union together with her East European allies and Communist China and, on the other, the United States of America, Western Europe and the other countries of the anti-communist bloc. The relative weakness in the military and economic spheres of the uncommitted nations

made this polarisation appear far more extensive than it was in reality.

In fact, most of Africa and South America as well as India was never firmly in either camp but the dangers of the cold war were so obvious that they tended to overshadow other developments. Not until Red China began to draw away from Russia did observers begin to realise that the shadowy East-West division between the communist powers and the Western Allies was insignificant beside the new alignment in which the emerging, underdeveloped countries of the world were moving together to challenge the traditional Great Powers. More and more the world was dividing into two groups, the 'haves' and the 'have nots' – a division which disregarded political creed.

In the last few years this realignment has developed to a position where a conflict between Russia and the West is unthinkable and wherein the Soviet Union more and more finds its natural place in the community of nations of European origin. The highly developed, highly civilised part of the world finds itself surrounded by a vast sea of underdeveloped nations which are no longer prepared to accept the state of affairs as it has existed in the past. The new nations are demanding political, economic and military advancement and their governments, in seeking to satisfy those demands, find themselves more and more coming into conflict with the interests of the older countries.

A situation is growing up parallel to that during the later days of the Roman Empire. Once again the centre of civilisation is besieged by those outside. The refinements of military power favour the highly developed nations at present but time is on the side of the outsiders. There is the danger of a vast political, economic and even military conflict.

The Great Wars of 1914-18 and 1939-45 were fought by the old hierarchy of Great Powers. From the first France and Austria never recovered. The second impoverished Britain, Italy, Germany and Japan and left only the United States and the Soviet Union in the first rank of world powers. Britain, although

THE EMERGENCE OF COLOURED RACES

victorious on both occasions, has, since 1945, gradually relinquished her once world-wide empire. Strangely, the granting of independence freely to the emerging nations has not led to their close relationship within the Commonwealth. The Afro-Asian countries which have received freedom from Britain have all chosen to become republics and their allegiance lies with the other new nations rather than with the mother country.

Since the 'have' nations are almost entirely populated by Europeans and the 'have nots' have coloured populations there is a danger that this world division may be seen as racial. It is not. Basically the division is economic. In present effect it is political and military. Race is irrelevant to the conflict of interests, but, because it is a subject which arouses emotions, it may well exacerbate this great political and economic division. We have decided that peaceful co-existence is possible between communist and non-communist societies. If we are to bridge the new division then there will have to be similar co-existence between societies differing in their racial backgrounds. Imperialism attempted to establish European societies in many parts of the world. It failed except where it found empty lands or sparse populations. Other cultures have proved as virile and resilient as our own. Socially, politically and economically the emerging nations will differ from the European countries. They will grow in strength and develop along their own lines. We should not seek to impose our ideas upon them nor to suggest that our pattern of society is necessarily one to be admired and copied by people of different temperaments and different traditions in completely different climatic conditions. Differences should be regarded as natural and not a cause for suspicion or enmity between nations. We accord to communist societies the privilege of being 'different'. We will have to offer the same privilege in years to come to other cultures which are different from our own.

Clearly then, there is room in this field for scientific investigation. The Anthropology and Sociology Departments of the universities could play a double part in this. Greater attention needs to be paid to human genetic diversity. There is no

evidence that either individuals or races are equal in their natural endowment. Moreover, it is clear that some of these inequalities are genetic or inborn. That is, there are limits to what can be done to equalise men's abilities by equalising their environmental opportunities, as by education, for example. This thesis of the basic differences between individuals and races has nothing to do with spurious arguments about racial superiority. Men are equal in their rights as human beings and in their right to develop in their own ways. This is not to suggest that education and training cannot fit a person of one race to take a leading part in the affairs of another. What is not known is to what heights he might have aspired had he remained among his own people. This establishes a principle. Any satisfactory political and economic system must be based on the recognition of human inequality. These differences are the glory of mankind and the mainspring of its varied achievements. The world might be simpler if they did not exist but it would be immeasurably poorer.

Thus we see that if Asiatic or African nations choose to follow their own ideas of social organisation we should encourage them to do so. Too often in the past we have implied that progress in other parts of the world is measured by conformity to European standards. This has led to the destruction of traditional values and the imposition of unnatural economic and social structures. Usually these have collapsed when either the military presence or the political influence on which they were based has been withdrawn.

Developing countries need aid, but this aid should be designed to help emerging nations develop in their own ways. Economic aid should not distort the economy of the country being assisted. Educational help should not set up values which are false within the developing society. Political friendship should not be dependent on the adoption of some alien form of political or social organisation. True friendship appreciates the individual personality of a friend and does not seek to impose conformity. The highly developed European nations should not expect other races

THE EMERGENCE OF COLOURED RACES

to build up within their boundaries some sort of New England, New France or New America nor even New Russia. Progress is not a journey along one roadway but rather movement along many branching paths. Respect for racial and cultural differences is the only hope for future peace. Race will lead to variations in approach and differences in aims but it need not lead to conflict as long as no one race seeks to dominate others.

Race-relations are perhaps the most emotional issues in the world today. Apartheid in South Africa, colour prejudice in the Deep South of the United States and colour-bar here in Britain, all these are the subject of books, newspaper stories, magazine articles, films and television plays, discussions, probes, speeches and slogans.

The issues are clouded by a tendency to lump all the racial questions of the world together as one problem. In fact the problems vary from place to place and there is no one simple solution. While recognising this we can learn something by examining the difficulties, and the progress, in other countries as long as we do not make the mistake of equating their problems with our own.

Practically everywhere in the modern world there is some degree of colour differentiation. Kroeber in *Anthropology* writes: 'There is no place on earth where something corresponding to a colour line is not drawn between two races occupying the same territory'. In the regions settled by Anglo-Saxons the colour line has been sharply drawn. Of all colonialists the British have been the least willing to mingle with their subject races. The growth of freedom among ex-colonial peoples and the general improvement in education have led to these ideas being challenged. The non-white two-thirds of the world will not accept the superiority of the white man any longer. Acts of racial discrimination play into the hands of communist propaganda. We of the Western world must rethink our position on this the most vital issue of the second half of the twentieth century.

Prejudice is a state of mind. Racial prejudice results from ill-educated minds being given false information. Such prejudice

may well lead to acts of discrimination. Often the poorest members of society show the greatest degree of prejudice. They have a desire to feel superior to someone – anyone. They can feel a conformity with their own kind by discriminating against outsiders. The poor white in the American South finds satisfaction amidst his poverty and ignorance in recalling that at least he is white. Any move towards racial equality will be strongly opposed because it reduces the value of this one asset of whiteness.

Ignorance of the facts about race has been increased by the difficulties of finding scientific agreement. On the specific question of Negro intelligence, which has been closely studied in the United States of America, just when it appeared researchers were coming to agree that there was no difference between the innate intelligence of white and coloured people, the survey *The Testing of Negro Intelligence* by A M Shuey has indicated that there may well be a significant difference. In a situation barren of facts prejudice thrives.

It is difficult to even define the term 'race'. We use it in its physical or its cultural sense quite haphazardly. In fact, it is possible only to broadly and generally divide mankind into racial groups – Caucasian, Mongoloid and Negroid. This does not greatly help a discussion of Britain's race problems where Indian Caucasians are classed as coloured along with West Indian Negroes. Equally a cultural division has little significance in the United States of America where the Negro has no separate culture of his own.

Comparison between members of different races in physique or intelligence is difficult since 'pure' racial specimens are hard to find. Then there is the problem of deciding criteria – a healthy pygmy, a strapping Zulu, a virile Chinese and a well-built European may vary in physical characteristics but no one is superior in all ways. It is even more difficult to test intelligence objectively. Environment, experience and even manners can affect performance on a test scale. What clearly emerges from all the investigations is that man is one species and that no racial group is superior to another.

THE EMERGENCE OF COLOURED RACES

This is not to fail to recognise, however, that there are differences between races. These differences are among equals and not on some vertical scale of values. It is these genuine differences which have led to arguments about racial superiority. Men make generalisations, particularly about their enemies, and from these generalisations spring doctrines of innate superiority or inferiority. It is easy to claim the inferiority of the bushman who cannot accept European, urbanised values but if the white man was set down to fend for himself in the Kalahari Desert would his superiority then be so apparent?

Frequently in the past 'superiority' has been no more than greater force of arms. The Jews having conquered Canaan regarded themselves as specially chosen of God. In fact, however, they intermarried with surrounding tribes and purity became a myth. These same people, in Europe, were regarded as inferior, yet a major problem of Hitler's racial purity campaign was the vast number of Germans who had one or more Jewish ancestors. Throughout history conquerors have established themselves as a nobility based on race but over the centuries the racial division has crumbled and disappeared. The Normans and the Saxons became one nation. Despite the strictest caste rules India has lost much of the original racial structure of society based on conquest. Clearly, of course, this process is slow and sometimes painful. Whether it is a desirable course of events is open to question.

Do we want to see racial and cultural differences disappear? If one culture is superior to another then there would be a strong argument for the better to prevail. But who is to decide which is better? Might it not be the lesser which prevailed by force of arms? If races are equal then the cultures they produce can be presumed to be equal in quality, though as different as the races creating them. Is not a society built up by people in a particular environment likely to be better suited to those conditions than one imposed from outside? Why should any group be told that their culture is inferior? Those who call for the integration of coloured immigrants into our society are muddled in their thinking. While prating about equality and non-discrimination they

A QUESTION OF COLOUR?

are, in fact, suggesting that the highest aim for an Indian, a Chinese or a Nigerian is to become a copy of an Englishman. How insulting to the cultures of others! There is no evidence to suggest that European culture is a natural development except among those of European descent in temperate climates. Other cultures are better suited to other conditions and to other racial characteristics.

It seems clear from historical evidence that urban civilisation is natural to Caucasian and Mongoloid peoples. It is most certainly not the natural environment for Negroes. No Negro society has ever created cities or industries. Rural life on a pastoral and agrarian basis has been the creation of Negro societies through the centuries. The failure of Liberia or Haiti to develop on European lines is clear evidence that this is not the natural pattern. To impose it on unwilling people seems to be wanton cruelty. We should retain our proper regard for the cultures of others even if we do not wish to emulate them ourselves.

The unhappiness of people transported into an alien civilisation and shorn of their own cultural heritage is clearly seen in the Negro population of the United States. Every effort should be made to protect the natural cultures of other races and the militarily and economically strong must resist the temptation to impose their own code of values on those weaker than themselves. It is as much subversion to weaken traditional culture with European influence as with communist infiltration.

In a world of independent states whose associations are those of equals, the danger of racial conflict can be averted except perhaps where the presence of ethnic minorities creates a flash point. The solution of colour problems in the United States, in South Africa and in half a hundred other states and territories is vital to the avoidance of a world-wide racial confrontation.

The problems of minorities vary according to circumstances but it is generally accepted that conflict only develops in a competitive situation. The Maoris of New Zealand and the Red Indians of North America no longer present racial problems,

THE EMERGENCE OF COLOURED RACES

since they are too few in numbers and too weak economically to compete with the majority. Australia's Aborigines fall into the same category. In the early days of settlement, when the relationship was that of competitors for land, there was bloodshed. Today the minority has conceded the victory and has either allowed itself to be absorbed or has withdrawn from contact with the majority.

Small groups of foreigners are rarely resented. Refugees are often sincerely welcomed. If, however, the group cannot readily be absorbed because of racial differences and it grows in strength then conflict develops. Indians have emigrated in considerable numbers to Ceylon, Burma, Malaya, Fiji, South Africa, Kenya, Tanganyika, Uganda, Mauritius, Trinidad and British Guiana. As poor minorities they could be disregarded, but over the years they have increased in numbers so that in Fiji, Trinidad, British Guiana and Mauritius they are either the majority now or will be in a relatively short while. Race-relations have greatly deteriorated. In these regions the conflict is between two coloured groups indicating that racial tension is not only a matter for relationships between whites and others. It may be between any two distinguishable ethnic or cultural groups.

In British colonies strict racial separation has gone hand in hand with a paternalistic concern for welfare. Health and education have been developed and there has been encouragement of economic growth. Customs such as slavery and suttee have been abolished but much local culture has been kept intact. Thus when Britain has given up her colonial rule there has usually been a cohesive local social structure based on traditional values. Parliamentary government has been one of the few features of British life to be transferred to colonial territories. Where it has survived the transition to independence its future in many cases is uncertain.

The French, Spanish and Portuguese have regarded their colonies as extensions of the mainland. Much more of the metropolitan culture has been carried to the colonies and there has been far greater intermarriage between the races. The weakness of this

A QUESTION OF COLOUR?

cultural arrogance, which suggests that the colonial subject is elevated by being accepted into a European culture, is that it destroys the old way of life and replaces it with only a veneer of European culture. That it is little appreciated is shown by the bitterness in the Portuguese colonies where colour prejudice has been negligible.

The Belgians treated all colonial citizens, both white and coloured, as equal but gave few political rights to them at all. Administration of the Congo was based on Brussels and merely relayed via Leopoldville. Lack of facilities for higher education and political experience led to the chaos in the Congo which followed the Belgian withdrawal. African leaders were torn between vestigial tribal loyalties and little-understood national concepts of government. The old tribal cohesion had been despoiled and replaced by European rule which, when suddenly withdrawn, left a vacuum. The degeneration into savagery which followed is the responsibility of those who despised the indigenous culture but failed to replace it with anything else permanent.

Colonial rule has varied widely in its aims and in its efficiency in carrying them out. It has failed to solve the problem of race-relations which are as explosive in ex-colonial territories as elsewhere. Where the European remains in any numbers he may be directly involved in the problem as in Kenya. Where he is in such small numbers as to be less involved the conflict between the other races is still equally bitter. For example, in Tanzania the poor African majority envies and dislikes the Indian community which controls the commercial life of the country. This dislike existed in colonial times but has increased since independence as Africans have found that promises of prosperity made by politicians were exaggerated. Resentment turns towards the racial minority which appears to exploit the majority. It is the direct counterpart of European anti-Semitism.

Tribal feeling based on historical enmities can lead to divisions and even conflict. There is tension in Kenya and open warfare in Burundi. Nigeria is divided on religious as well as tribal grounds.

THE EMERGENCE OF COLOURED RACES

Clearly, nations which can avoid having minority problems are well advised to do so.

In the West Indies and South America peoples of many races have mingled. Brazil has been a melting pot for Europeans, Indians, Negroes and even Chinese and Japanese. In these regions multi-racial societies have been created. These are the models for those who campaign for integration. They have shown that intermarriage results in no reduction in health, intelligence or vigour. What they have not done, however, is to avoid colour prejudice. There may be no colour-bar but there is a clearly defined colour scale. Socially a light skin is a great asset. In the West Indies a dark skin is a political advantage. Regardless of multi-racialism colour remains a vital factor. Brazil in particular likes to pretend that racial feeling is absent but there is great colour-consciousness based on the old Portuguese aristocracy. Anti-Semitism is also growing and causing much concern. There is no doubt that a multi-racial society can be developed but its achievements in the field of race-relations appear very limited, and the cost in the subordination of the more natural cultures of minorities appears very high. No case has been made out to show that multi-racial societies excel in any way and since they do not solve the problems of race-relations there seems to be little to gain from their artificial creation.

The Peoples of Britain

THE British people have developed from the mingling of many races. Celt, Roman, Saxon, Viking, Norman, Fleming, Italian, German and Huguenot, all have contributed through the ages to the making of the Briton. Each successive wave of immigrants, varying from massive invasions to the small entries of refugee or trading groups, has left its distinct impression on our national life. There has always been some resistance from the settled population to the newcomers. Sometimes the resistance has to be crushed by military force but in the end the victors and the vanquished have amalgamated and been absorbed into our national fabric.

The European immigrants from the time of the Norman Conquest until the nineteenth century brought skills to this country. In 1337 Edward III admitted the Flemish weavers and the whole economic life of the country was altered.

The Huguenots, who fled from persecution in France after 1572 and again later in 1681, brought with them skill in glass- and paper-making, in tapestry and silk weaving. All these people were European Christians and although the process was slow, their ultimate absorption by our society was of no great difficulty due to their relatively small numbers.

Their presence was never popular and on many occasions efforts were made to persuade the monarch to expel the 'foreigners'. German traders needed to live within their 'Steel Yard' for protection from London mobs, while Huguenot refugees were popularly supposed to be creating unemployment among English workers.

The Jews, excluded from England by Edward I in 1290, were

THE PEOPLES OF BRITAIN

permitted to return in 1656 by Oliver Cromwell. These European Jews kept their religious individuality but formed themselves into an integral part of our society, and by the middle of the nineteenth century there were some 100,000 in this country. The later holding of the office of Prime Minister by Disraeli indicates the degree to which integration had taken place. The Jews managed to be a part of British society without abandoning their cultural identity.

Popular opposition to the Jews, and the Huguenots too, was expressed in the mob-cry 'No Jews! No wooden shoes!', but in 1753 Jews were allowed to naturalise and they took advantage of this opportunity to become British citizens. In any case the wholesale massacre of Jews in organised pogroms, a feature of Central and Eastern European life for many centuries, never disfigured our national behaviour. Jews were not regarded with great affection, but anti-Semitism was never deeply rooted in Britain.

The flood of French *émigrés* fleeing the Revolution led to the passing of the 1793 Aliens Act which made the registration of foreigners compulsory. This was a war-time measure necessitated by spy scares and the threat of invasion. Most of the refugees were well-to-do people who had no intention of remaining in this country permanently. A considerable number of French prisoners were incarcerated in Dartmoor after capture and a small number chose to remain in this country after the end of hostilities. In 1815 most of the French *émigrés* returned to their homes in their own country and the aliens legislation was soon abandoned.

In the nineteenth century the pattern of immigration changed. Instead of small groups of skilled entrants Britain received large numbers of refugees from political tyranny and economic disaster in Europe. Most of these new entrants were illiterate and unskilled and would have created insuperable problems had not the rapid industrialisation of the economy created an insatiable demand for labour.

The Irish have throughout the centuries entered this country in relatively large numbers. In 1413, after much agitation, they were expelled by statute but the flow inwards soon resumed and

has always defied limitation or restriction. Even the 1962 Immigration Control Act accepted that Irish migrants could not be controlled. Many of those who have come have sought seasonal work and returned to Ireland for the remainder of the year. This itinerant pattern remains. The men find work on building and civil engineering projects while the women help with the harvests of fruit and potatoes. Today many Irish men are attracted by the vast motorway programme.

In the nineteenth century irregularity of employment was endemic among English workers as well as among migrants. Many of the flood of Irish immigrants of 1846-7 at the time of the Potato Famines were unable to find work in Britain so they turned their eyes further afield. Thousands joined the vast flow to the United States of America and the attractions of that land led to relatively few Irish settling permanently in England until the quota system for entry into the United States of America was devised in 1929. After that, emigration to the United Kingdom started again but the economic conditions of the inter-war years kept the numbers low. Immigration from Ireland into Britain is not at present subject to control and some 400,000 Irish are today resident in this country in addition to the large number of itinerants.

The pogroms in Eastern Europe and Russia at the end of the nineteenth century led to a large exodus of Jews to the West, including Britain and the United States. The new entrants were dreadfully poor and had been unable to develop any skills in the ghettos of the Russian Empire. They settled mainly in London, where tailoring and peddling were their most common activities. Their frugality and business sense stood them in good stead and within one generation many of these families were able to develop businesses which allowed them to move out of the East End. They have remained an urban people and their field of activity has concentrated on the retail trades with tailoring remaining of special importance.

The Jewish population is now some 450,000 strong and is well integrated into the community in most of our larger towns and

THE PEOPLES OF BRITAIN

cities. During the years of the bestial Nazi 'Final Solution' the Jewish population of Britain was the only one in Europe to increase in numbers. Since the establishment of the State of Israel there has been a small emigration movement but the vast majority of Britain's Jews continue to regard themselves as British. They see no difficulty in reconciling their remaining as Jews with their intention to be completely British. They are able to achieve social mobility and find very little resentment of their presence in the community. Anti-Semitism is a negligible feature of our society.

Absorption and loss of identity seem unlikely to be complete in the case of the Jews. It has been estimated that more than a quarter of the men marry outside the Jewish community though less than a fifth of the women do likewise. Thus there is an undeniable element of absorption but it is limited by the strong sense of community which has been increased of recent years by the pride taken in the achievements of the new Israel. Charitable institutions and social organisations supplement the religious bond and help to maintain the cultural identity of British Jewry. The concentration of Jews in the large towns is another factor in reducing absorption. In all, it appears likely that the Jewish community in Britain will remain an example of how to achieve full integration without losing cultural or religious identity.

In 1940 some 27,000 Poles escaped to Britain and in 1946 another 100,000 entered. About 10,000 of these have since left Britain to find homes in Australia or the United States of America. The remainder have found a place in our society. Since there was a majority of men in the inflow intermarriage was inevitable.

The community now consists of some 130,000 people. Some of the oldest folk speak little English but many of the children speak practically no Polish. No new inflow of Poles is taking place, so the population is ageing and after this generation will have lost most of its distinctiveness. As European Christians the Poles have found little difficulty in settling into the British community.

Much the same can be said of the Balts and Ukrainians who came as refugees after the war. The second generation is

completely British. Political conditions in their homelands make return impossible and national identification difficult. Absorption is only a matter of time.

The Hungarian rising of 1956 led to the arrival of more than 21,000 refugees. A third of these proceeded to Canada, the United States or Australia, but some 14,500 remained. They were greeted with great sympathy and although at first there was difficulty in finding employment for some of them, they have now largely dispersed and been absorbed by the community.

There are some half a million aliens resident here at any one time. They are usually transient and do not seek to become part of British society. Diplomats, visitors, business men, trainees and students form a large part of this group, but some bodies such as the Italian workers in Bedford can be regarded as immigrants.

These 60,000 Italians are mostly from peasant families. Coming from the south of Italy they have known poverty and hardship. They bring little in the way of national culture with them. There is a sentimental attachment to Italy and the Italian language but there is no positive resistance to integration. Unless there is a continuous flow of recruits, which appears unlikely, the next generation will be absorbed into British society.

The Cypriot community, on the other hand, strongly opposes absorption. They wish to fit into our society but insist on retaining their identity. Their position is best summed up as 'with our society but not of it'. Even so, many of the children, especially the boys, who are less strictly controlled than the girls, will clearly become part of the wider society particularly in a cosmopolitan community like that of London.

The 45,000-strong Chinese community is a unique body. There is no intention whatsoever of integrating with British society if this means loss of cultural identity. The Chinese, 30,000 of whom come from Hong Kong, keep to themselves and positively seek effacement. They have chosen withdrawal from social contact as the defence of their individuality. Despite their sizeable community there is no racial feeling against them because they avoid the sort of contact which might lead to conflict. This, I would

THE PEOPLES OF BRITAIN

suggest, indicates that colour of itself is not a major factor in determining attitudes. The Chinese are not white yet they find no colour prejudice in this country. Minimum involvement is, then, one way for a minority to avoid the situations in which discrimination might arise.

These relatively small groups have not affected the structure of our society. They have caused few problems and little resentment. Far different is the vast flood of coloured immigrants which has reached these shores since 1948. In enormous numbers they have taken up residence in our overcrowded cities. They have changed the appearance of suburbs and even of whole towns. This flood has raised fundamental objections from those who have lived in contact with it. Why is this when we have such a record of tolerance towards strangers?

In common parlance, the phrase 'coloured immigrants' has come to mean the large number of newcomers from the Indian sub-continent, the West Indies and Africa. Light-skinned Indians, brown-skinned Jamaicans and jet-black African Negroes are all somewhat irrationally lumped together as one group. Although this grouping is purely arbitrary I shall accept it, since it corresponds to the attitude of most people in those areas of Britain which have received considerable numbers of such immigrants.

These newcomers are not the first group of coloured residents of this country. In the past there have been relatively small numbers of coloured citizens here on several occasions. During the eighteenth century Negro servants were popular among well-to-do householders.

As slavery fell into disrepute among civilised nations so the popularity of Negro servants declined. From the middle of the eighteenth century only small numbers of Negroes came to this country. They were mostly seamen or visiting delegates from African territories.

Not until the 1914-18 War was there again any sizeable coloured inflow. Coloured seamen and members of labour battalions who remained in this country formed small communities in such seaport towns as Liverpool and Cardiff. There was

little hostility at first but the economic difficulties and resultant unemployment of the 1930's led to some bitterness in the competition for jobs.

Widespread under-employment in the West Indies resulted in an incentive to seek work overseas but the chance of contract employment in the nearer United States of America diverted attention from Britain. After 1939 the demand for recruits for the services and war industries changed the position.

Numerous West Indians served with the armed forces and considerable numbers of others came to work in the factories. After the war some remained, thus keeping a link between British industries and families in the West Indies. Others returned home to make unfavourable comparisons between economic conditions in the underdeveloped West Indies and those in industrial Britain.

Post-war labour shortages were an encouragement to immigration. In June 1948 the *Empire Windrush* brought 492 West Indians, including one girl, to this country. The flood was beginning. Up to 1951 there was a steady flow of West Indians, mostly Jamaicans, but numbers never exceeded 1,000 a year. Then, in 1952, the McCarren Act closed the doors of the United States. Entry of Commonwealth citizens was still unrestricted into the United Kingdom so an immediate increase in the flow to this country ensued.

The granting of independence to former colonial territories has meant that our control over the emigration of their citizens has ceased. Faced with massive unemployment and under-employment, new Commonwealth Governments have shown little willingness to restrict the outflow. India and Pakistan originally imposed restrictions at the request of the British Government but the West Indies Government's refusal to act similarly led to a relaxation of control. As a result there has been a sharp increase in the number of immigrants from India and Pakistan. Land hunger and lack of opportunity at home, coupled with the lure of high wages, have brought a flood of non-English-speaking, non-Christian immigrants from the Indian sub-continent.

THE PEOPLES OF BRITAIN

The main groups of coloured immigrants still coming to Britain are those from the West Indies, India and Pakistan. Each of these groups contains people of different cultures, educational background and industrial skill.

The West Indians come from islands which themselves have diverse social patterns. They are usually Christians, often belonging to relatively small Protestant sects. West Indian culture is in many ways based on the British, but there is much variation. There is little discrimination on grounds of colour in the West Indies though there is more in Barbados than in Jamaica. In the islands the division is social rather than based on colour. Even so marriages between persons whose skins are very different in shade are frequently disapproved by the family with the lighter colour.

Real colour feeling is increased when a West Indian finds himself in a minority in British society. Most West Indians are literate after education loosely similar to that in Britain. There is social mobility in the West Indies and, for example, white society in Trinidad has accepted members of Chinese origin without difficulty.

Strangely enough in a society where children are so much liked, family life is unstable among West Indians. While the upper classes accept British marriage norms, for many the pattern is early parenthood but late marriage. Illegitimacy and the unmarried mother are accepted features of the West Indian social scene. Children are made much of in early life but uncertain home conditions lead to high juvenile delinquency rates later on.

The first West Indian immigrants were skilled or semi-skilled, since such persons alone could afford the fares. Later more unskilled people have been aided in their passages by those already here. The pressure of economic instability in the Caribbean plus that exerted by a quickly growing population make immigration attractive.

The United Kingdom is the only industrial country which, until 1962, was prepared to take unlimited numbers of immigrants from the West Indies.

The prospect of full employment and the attractions of the

Welfare State have made Britain a mecca for the under-employed. Remittances by immigrants are an important feature of the West Indian economy, reaching £3,000,000 a year.

Before 1951 the number of West Indians entering Britain was less than 1,000 a year. They now form the largest group of coloured immigrants resident here – some 24 per cent of the total. Between 1945 and 1961, 263,700 came to Britain. These were mostly males and their families are now joining them. The Immigration Act does not limit dependants and in 1962–3 70 per cent of West Indians entering were dependants of those already here.

While there is much talk of returning to the Caribbean far more West Indians are making permanent homes here than are members of other immigrant races. They express the wish to be integrated into British society.

The 1961 Census showed West Indians to be the largest immigrant group in London, Birmingham, Manchester, Bristol, Leeds, Nottingham and Sheffield. Since so many are aiming to stay here permanently and the birth rate in Jamaica is forty-three per thousand of the population per annum, compared with that in England of seventeen per thousand, we can expect West Indians to remain the largest coloured group and to increase, both compared with other minorities and with the population as a whole.

Indians form the second largest coloured group. They vary considerably in both colour and social background according to the State of their origin. Bengal, Bihar, Gujerat, Punjab and Tamilnad have provided most immigrants. India's annual population increase is more than the total number of people in the Greater London area. The income per head is very low and there is much under-employment. Political links with Britain in the past and the 'open door' policy before 1962 combined to turn the eyes of many Indian immigrants towards this country.

Most Indian immigrants are Hindus but the Sikhs from the Punjab are a separate and fiercely independent community. In Britain the strict rules of Hindu religion are perforce relaxed but remain in the background to be enforced once again on return to India.

THE PEOPLES OF BRITAIN

There is wide variation of educational attainments. Many immigrants speak no English and are illiterate in their own languages. Others may have had education up to university degree standard but, finding little opportunity at home, have emigrated with a willingness to accept unskilled work if necessary. Indian students who remain in this country after training are an important group – particularly the doctors.

Indian immigrants regard their stay in this country as temporary. They find their place within the society set up by their regional and language group. Rashmi Desai writes in *Indian Immigrants in Britain*: 'Immigrants themselves desire exclusion', and 'The Indian immigrants recognise as neighbours only those who belong to their own linguistic-regional group and find this sufficient. They ignore the rest.'

Now that more wives and children are arriving these groups will probably prove more self-sufficient and the liaisons with white women, so disapproved by Indian as well as English society, may well disappear.

Indians are distributed in a manner very similar to the West Indians. They are concentrated round London, Birmingham, Coventry, Manchester, Leeds, Bristol, Bradford and in Liverpool where they are the largest coloured group.

Pakistanis, however, are distributed so that more live in the Birmingham area than in London, while in Bradford they are a majority among immigrants. Most of the Pakistanis are bachelors who, aiming to return home, do not so often send for their families. After marriage in Pakistan they may return here for another period, often leaving their wives at home. Remittances from England are of great importance, being equal to the whole internal revenue of East Pakistan. Pakistanis are Moslems and very few of the immigrants are more than barely literate. Pakistani wives in this country retain their national customs. They rarely go out except to visit other women of their own race. Most of the shopping is done by the men. Food, clothes, law and customs are transferred from Pakistan to Birmingham or Bradford. The husband may well have more than one wife and his

wishes are all-important. In fact, Pakistani women are 'protected' by stricter purdah here than they would be at home.

The children attend English schools but daughters are usually sent home at the age of thirteen or fourteen if this can be afforded. The idea that they should form relationships with non-Moslems and even seek marriage is quite unthinkable. Integration into British society is therefore unlikely in the foreseeable future.

These three groups are, of course, supplemented by considerable numbers of Africans, but most of these are students - Nigeria sending by far the largest group. In certain areas Arabs are numerous but they are mainly confined to seaports and are a relatively small transient group.

The pattern of immigration has changed recently in two directions. First, Indians and Pakistanis have replaced the West Indians as the most numerous entrants and, second, the number of dependants arriving now far outnumbers the flow of new male immigrants.

Some eight out of every 1,000 employed workers are now coloured immigrants and, of course, in some areas the proportion is much higher. Of all students receiving higher or further education one in ten is from overseas. At London University the proportion reaches a quarter.

Most students intend to return home at the end of their courses of study. Many of them take great pride in the cultures of their own countries and the political progress being made, particularly in Africa. However, a significant proportion of coloured students seek to remain here and find employment. This group is one of the significant illegal additions to the immigrant labour force. Deserters from ships calling at British ports, particularly Pakistanis and Arabs, also find their way into jobs.

A more expensive method of illegal entry is to book a return ticket for a holiday in Britain or the Republic of Ireland and then simply fail to return. Little difficulty is found in obtaining such documents as National Health cards since the serious questioning of a non-English-speaking applicant is usually quite impractical.

Forged work permits and passports are also used for entry as

THE PEOPLES OF BRITAIN

are valid documents obtained but not used and sold on the black market. The crude nature of some such attempts is shown by the recent arrival of a group of bearded and turbaned Sikhs whose passports proclaimed them to be New Zealand citizens!

Those who arrive with genuine permits and passports are often from the poor villages of India, Pakistan or Jamaica. How, then, are air fares or boat passages afforded? Some scrape and save. Others travel on money sent home by those already here. Most arrive owing their fare, plus interest, to family groups, syndicates or shady travel agents.

They are frequently further indebted to the same groups for accommodation on arrival, frugal existence until a job is found and, perhaps, even an extra sum for introduction to the foreman. Such indebtedness takes a large part of the immigrant's earnings and, since he often wishes to send back money to his relatives, he has little hope of saving for his return home except by accepting very low living standards.

The flood of immigrants has continued despite the Commonwealth Immigrants Act 1962. In the last quarter of 1963 the 30,000 new entrants equalled the total for 1958. The mass of immigrants are concentrated in the industrial areas where housing and social services generally are inadequate.

Within these areas the great cities are most affected. London and Birmingham have the highest numbers and proportions but even within the cities the immigrants are not evenly spread. They are concentrated in certain suburbs where they may account for 20 per cent of the population. Towns such as Smethwick have some 9 per cent of their total population made up of coloured people. The effect on the social structures of the towns can well be imagined. Estimates vary widely but probably the number of coloured residents in Britain is now in the region of a million.

The 1961 Census showed that the Greater London area had the highest number, but the West Midlands, with 1.84 per cent of the population consisting of coloured immigrants, had the higher density of settlement. West Yorkshire was third while South East Lancashire and Merseyside and Tyneside also have heavy

TABLE I
ESTIMATED NET COMMONWEALTH IMMIGRATION

1955-62

From	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962 (First 6 months)
West Indies	27,500	29,800	23,000	15,000	16,400	49,650	66,300	31,800
India	5,800	5,600	6,600	6,200	2,950	5,900	23,750	19,050
Pakistan	1,850	2,050	5,200	4,700	850	2,500	25,100	25,080
Cyprus	3,450	2,750	1,450	2,700	400	3,200	6,850	3,150
West African territories	1,500	2,000	2,200	950	750	—500	5,450	6,650
East African territories	700	700	650	400	150	250	2,650	1,980
Hong Kong	300	500	900	200	450	500	2,150	2,160
Others	1,550	3,400	2,400	—300	—350	—3,800	4,150	5,050
Total	42,650	46,800	42,400	29,850	21,600	57,700	136,400	94,900

A minus sign denotes a net outward movement

THE PEOPLES OF BRITAIN

concentrations. There is no reason to think that the pattern has changed in the last few years.

Estimates for the net balance of immigration during the years 1955 – June 1962 are shown in Table I.

In the ten years up to December 1964, more than 616,000 immigrants arrived to swell the numbers already present in this country in 1955.

The second six months of 1962 showed a marked fall in the net intake of immigrants. In the period July – December 1962 the net increase was 2,503 compared with 94,900 in the first six months of the year.

TABLE II COMMONWEALTH IMMIGRATION

July–December 1962

Voucher holders	5,121
Students	12,596
Dependants	8,832
Visitors	99,903
All others	56,964
Total admitted	183,416
Number embarked	180,913
Net balance	2,503

However, 1963 and 1964 showed a return to the upward trend and a new tendency for dependants to replace male workers as the most numerous entrants. Table III gives the figures for these two years.

This trend was continued in 1965. The first five months of that year showed a net increase of 25,888 compared with 24,345 for the same period in 1964. June 1965 brought a net increase of 6,300 of whom 4,715 were women and children. A year earlier the monthly increase was 5,447 of whom 3,800 were dependants.

The April 1961 Census showed that there were 596,755 Commonwealth citizens registered as resident in Britain at that time. This figure is almost certainly an underestimate due to the

TABLE III
COMMONWEALTH IMMIGRATION

1963-4

From	1963				1964			
	Holders of Ministry of Labour vouchers	Dependants	Others admitted for settlement	Total number admitted	Holders of Ministry of Labour vouchers	Dependants	Others admitted for settlement	Total number admitted
The whole Commonwealth	30,125	26,234	3,447	365,737	14,705	37,460	3,735	406,601
India	8,366	6,616	501	42,109	3,828	8,770	435	44,468
Pakistan	13,526	3,304	261	29,573	3,296	7,046	180	27,266
West Indian Islands	1,893	7,089	949	23,717	2,452	10,476	1,333	31,291

failure of landlords to register temporary residents for fear of charges of overcrowding.

Net immigration since April 1961 is estimated as 401,180. This gives a total of 997,935 not including children born here, but including white Commonwealth citizens.

Some idea of the number of children can be gained from the fact that of the increase in population from mid-1964 to mid-1965 of 400,000, some 28,000, or 7 per cent, was accounted for by births to immigrants.

None of these figures includes citizens of the Republic of Ireland of whom 422,000 entered between 1946 and the end of 1962. Some 300,000 applications for entry from the Indian sub-continent are still outstanding and another 300,000 Indians and Pakistanis in East Africa hold British passports. The number of potential immigrants appears to be almost infinite.

The Times in 1965 carried a series of articles called *The Dark Million*. Much depends on how you define 'dark' but certainly the number of coloured immigrants is in the region of one million and will rise steadily. This is a situation completely unlike anything we have ever known before.

By the year 2000, our population is expected to rise to some 70,000,000. Of these, assuming a net immigration rate of 20,000 a year and a birth rate reflecting present trends, more than 3,700,000 will be coloured immigrants or their children. More than 5 per cent of the population would fall into this category. This will happen if we do not make a positive decision to stop it.

No government has sought a mandate to make this fundamental change in our society. No party has actively promoted this flood of immigrants. In later chapters I shall examine the figures in more detail. For now it suffices to pose the question – do we believe it will be possible to retain our peculiarly British, traditional way of life if we have a coloured minority almost four million strong?

The Colour Problem Abroad

BEFORE we examine the actions taken to deal with race-relations problems in Britain it will be well to turn aside to see if we can learn from the experience of other countries. If they can solve the difficulties of reconciling differing cultures within one nation then their example would be invaluable. On the other hand we can perhaps manage to avoid the mistakes others have made in handling similar problems.

The United States of America and South Africa have both faced, for many years, the kind of situation which is just developing here in Britain. Rhodesia is struggling to solve both constitutional and racial problems at the same time. Other European countries have admitted numerous immigrants and have encountered difficulties not entirely unlike our own. Even the communist countries have not been free from the difficulties caused by the bringing together of people of different races and cultures.

From the vast panorama of nations facing racial problems only a few examples can be chosen for consideration here. These are the most highly publicised – and often least understood – or those whose problems are most like our own. Conscious of our own mistakes and failures we can examine the records of others with sympathy.

Since we have a coloured minority which could approach 6 per cent of the population by the end of the century, America's 10 per cent Negro minority presents many parallels with our own situation. We should, however, beware of equating the problems of the two countries. There are similarities but they are definitely not the same.

UNITED STATES

The American Negro was brought from Africa as a slave and has been a free citizen for only a hundred years. For the twenty million Negroes the transition has been long and hard. In the Southern States recognition of the civil rights of coloured people has been slow and grudging. It has also been difficult for the six million Jews, the five million Puerto Ricans, the million Mexicans and the Japanese and Chinese minorities to achieve full equality of citizenship.

The United States has been a melting pot, but it has been only the white Christian groups which have been readily absorbed. Other bodies have been kept at a distance by the law, by personal and mass prejudice and by violence. Such groups as the Ku Klux Klan have thrived on policies of depriving minority groups – not only Negroes – of their civil rights.

Since the Negroes are the largest minority their struggle has aroused most attention and resistance. Twenty-nine American states seek to define 'coloured' before the law. Twenty-nine states restrict marriage between the races. Only slowly is education becoming desegregated after the long years of a policy of 'separate but equal' which resulted in 'separate but blatantly unequal'.

Federal policy which has long paid lip service to equality retained a bias against coloured immigration until 1965. Laws and declarations of the Southern States have maintained defiance even during the gradual retreat. Restrictions on voting, travel and housing have remained even when outlawed. Public opinion has been inflamed against 'uppity niggers' in the Deep South, especially in Alabama, Georgia and Mississippi.

The struggle for equal rights has been more successful in recent years. The international situation has made the Negro's position one of political urgency. Emerging African nations have to be placated, particularly at the United Nations, and international communism has taken advantage of the propaganda effects of every piece of news of racial discrimination in the United States.

Successes have been claimed by the civil rights movements, but probably they were no more than marginally successful. Civil rights are being granted to Negroes because it is politically impractical to do anything else. Agitators and demonstration organisers, if anything, delay the granting of civil rights by creating fears in the minds of reasonable white people that the claims of the white extremists about Negro aims are, perhaps, justified.

From the time of the emancipation during the Civil War the Negro has steadily gained in status. The resistance to this progress has been strongest to the south of the Mason-Dixon line and at its most violent in the Deep South states.

After the end of the war Negroes exerted considerable power in the regions in which they were numerous. Many were elected to state legislatures and in some cases held a majority of the seats. Their efforts were not very successful, however, because of their complete lack of training and the unfortunate 'advice' given by self-seeking, ruthless 'carpet-baggers'. Gradually the old dominance of the white community was re-established and the institution of property and literacy qualifications for voting deprived many Negroes of the franchise in the Southern States.

In the North the Negro in theory had equal rights but resistance to the exercise of full equality in social, economic and political situations has been continuous. Restrictive covenants on housing, either open or secret, have kept Negroes in some particular area and out of others. Educational provision in Negro districts and the provision of social amenities have been on a less generous scale.

In the South a programme of 'separate but equal' honestly carried out could have some meaning if the Negroes were newly arrived foreigners with a cultural heritage of their own, but this is not so. The American Negro is American. He has had no contact with Africa for generations and no vestige of African culture remains. Separate development, therefore, is completely unreal and unreasonable in the American situation. The Negro must become part of the body politic of the United States with

THE COLOUR PROBLEM ABROAD

equal opportunities for education, employment and social advancement.

Much of the fear which nurtures anti-Negro behaviour is at root sexual—'The end place of integration is the bedroom'. This fear has led to legislation against miscegenation. If it was justified it might be understandable, but it seems unlikely that Negroes, who take a pride in their race and their position in society, would seek to exercise the right to intermarry to any alarming extent. In countries where intermarriage is legal it has remained exceptional. While the Negro remains subservient, however, this latent sexual fear will not be eradicated.

Gunnar Myrdal in *An American Dilemma* points out that in fact the Negro's order of preference for the achievement of equality is the inverse of the white community's order of resistance. The Negro places his demands for equality in this order:

- | | |
|--------------|--------------------|
| (1) Jobs | (4) Hotels |
| (2) Votes | (5) Schools |
| (3) Travel | (6) Private houses |
| (7) Marriage | |

It is the fact that the demand is greatest where the resistance is least that gives hope for a progressive settlement. At the same time resistance from 'poor whites', particularly in the less prosperous South, can be expected at all points of the scale.

The war years of 1941-5, with their full employment and mobility of labour, brought opportunities for Negroes to move from the South to other regions. It offered those who remained the chance of employment other than of a menial nature. Negroes who served in the armed forces abroad found less rigid segregation.

Probably the sight of Negro soldiers overseas arm in arm with white girls helped to harden some opinion against Negro advancement. Many of the white troops who resented the sight forgot that the freedom exercised had novelty value and that there were no coloured girls in Britain or Germany, for example, for the Negro soldiers to accompany.

Bodies such as the National Association for the Advancement

of Coloured People have found widespread support. The NAACP has had a membership, at times, of well over 400,000. The aim has been economic and social advance. A highly publicised incident in 1949 indicates the lack of reality in the sexual fears of white segregationists. When Walter White, the coloured National leader of the NAACP, married a white woman some 40 per cent of the Negro membership resigned in protest!

The relatively moderate policy of the NAACP has given rise to the creation of more impatient bodies such as CORE, the Committee on Racial Equality, which has a multi-racial membership, and SNCC, the Student Non-violent Co-ordinating Committee. These organisations are responsible for the more 'active' demonstrations of recent years.

Extremist coloured organisations have also been formed, but the good sense of the Negro has been shown in the limited support given to such bodies as the Black Muslims. Violence in Harlem, New Jersey and Los Angeles in 1965 indicates that there is a pattern of organisation behind the demonstrations. The use of firearms in Los Angeles and incendiary bombs in Chicago suggests that extremist Negro groups are moving in on troubled areas. Leaders who call for immediate action and who train their followers in combat techniques are to blame for the casualties caused. Organisations of this type only increase resistance to Negro advancement.

A policy of gradualness is the most effective way of making progress. Books like *Why We Can't Wait* by James Baldwin, with their harshly caricatured white people, and films such as *Coloured Like You*, with the same exaggeration of the problems, can only fan the flames of hate. Senator Strom Thurmond criticised the Johnson Administration after the Los Angeles riots for 'placating minority groups and leading them to believe that they can do anything and get away with it'. Republican House Leader Gerald Ford called for more effective enforcement of the law and demanded a weeding out of 'radical elements that use racial tension for their own ends' from the Civil Rights Movement.

Violent demonstrations tend to aid the cause of the opposing

THE COLOUR PROBLEM ABROAD

side. Marches and riots harden the hearts of the white community just as violence against Negroes tends to increase sympathy for their cause. Northern agitators who organise demonstrations and then depart, leaving the Southern Negro to face the wrath of his opponents, are as much to blame for ill-feeling as are brutal sheriffs and their deputies.

The years 1963-4 saw a long battle in the United States Congress which led to the passing in June 1964 of an omnibus civil rights measure. This Act made an attempt to end segregation in facilities serving the general public and also sought to outlaw discrimination in employment. The United States Attorney General took powers to prosecute anyone who violated the civil rights of any other person as guaranteed by the Constitution. These measures did not, however, bring an end to discrimination against Negroes wishing to enrol as voters in the Deep South. The fear that Negroes would vote *en bloc* for Negro candidates has led to the withholding of the right to exercise the franchise from coloured Southerners. As white citizens point out, Negroes make up 74.9 per cent of the population of Burke County, Georgia, and 84.7 per cent of Lowndes County, Alabama. It is much easier to be liberal if one lives in, say, Newhaven, Connecticut, with its 2.2 per cent than in the South.

The success of the Federal legislation against discrimination in public places and in education led to a concentration by Negro leaders on the question of voting. Negroes in the South have been kept off the voting lists by high qualification requirements and by the misuse of literacy tests. A white applicant might be asked, for example, the name of the President, while a Negro might be asked a question which would be difficult for a college professor to answer. One Negro was asked how many windows there are in the White House! There is also the story, probably apocryphal, that a Negro would-be voter was asked what was meant by 'the four types of *ex-post facto* laws as indicated in the case of Colder versus Ball'. His reply was 'Boss, I guess that means us niggers don't vote in this here county!' A paradox is that despite the difficulties of registration the Negro vote in the United States

was large enough to account for the election of President Kennedy in 1960 when he had so narrow a majority over Richard Nixon.

In early 1965, Dr Martin Luther King, the Negro leader, decided to hold a series of demonstrations and marches centred on Selma, Alabama, to spotlight the difficulties faced by Negroes seeking to register as voters. At first the demonstrations had little success in the face of 'peaceful containment' by the authorities. However, the position was changed overnight when an attempted march from Selma to the state capital, Montgomery, was broken up with unnecessary violence. The use of clubs and tear gas against the marchers was shown widely on television.

President Johnson responded to the anger of Americans against this brutality by presenting to Congress a strong Bill to ensure equal voting rights. States which operated registration tests and which had less than half their adult citizens on the register of voters were to be forced to dispense with the tests or to prove to a Federal court that they had not discriminated during the last ten years. Mississippi, Louisiana, Georgia, South Carolina and parts of North Carolina were directly affected. Only in parts of Florida and Kentucky does the present system of voting discrimination escape the effects of the Bill. In such limited areas legal processes under the present law should ultimately be effective.

The Voting Rights Bill was signed by President Johnson on 6th August 1965 with the words: 'It brings within our immediate vision the day when every American can enter a polling booth without fear or hindrance.' The Attorney General will bring cases to test the 'constitutionality' of the Bill. The poll taxes in Alabama, Mississippi, Texas and Virginia will be the first targets. While moderate leaders welcomed the Bill more extreme organisations such as CORE were still dissatisfied. They would like the poll tax and literacy tests swept away and for the Federal Government to take responsibility for registration of voters.

Southern resistance has been weakened by political division and by economic considerations. The Southern Democrats, who

THE COLOUR PROBLEM ABROAD

for so long resisted civil rights legislation, have been worried by Republican progress in the traditionally Democratic South.

The combination of political, economic and moral pressure is proving irresistible and the traditional servitude of the Negro is being swept away. In both North and South the Negro is advancing his economic and social position.

There seems to be overwhelming support for the extension of full civil rights to Negroes. The Churches have played a large part in this movement.

In education segregation is almost completely ended and discrimination is rapidly dwindling. All inter-state transport is desegregated and shops and drugstores no longer discriminate between customers. The very cost of 'separate but equal' programmes has made them burdens which may be laid down with relief.

An unexpected feature in this rise in Negro status is the reduction in social contacts between the races. The educated, prosperous Negro avoids situations in which he might meet embarrassment. He therefore comes less into day-to-day personal contact with white families than he did as a servant. Improved status has also led to reduced militancy among moderate Negro organisations, giving extremist groups a relatively greater prominence.

White and Negro extremist groups attract only fringe support but the danger of their sparking off incidents which sour the whole question of race-relations is very real. On the Negro side the Black Muslims have received much publicity. James Baldwin in his book *The Fire Next Time* describes his visit to Elijah Muhammad, the sect's leader. Baldwin's own bitterness is reflected in the Black Muslim policy of separate nations. They suggest the handing over to the Negroes of some of the Southern States.

The shooting of Malcolm X, the Negro leader who broke away from the Black Muslims to form his own group, might well have led to fierce strife between factions of the extremist Negro movement. The fact that further violence was averted is an indication of the degree of discipline wielded by these groups.

Outbreaks of violence and rioting in Negro quarters such as Harlem take on a different aspect when considered in this light. The assertions that such incidents were inspired cannot be proven but rumours that action groups of extremist organisations seek to cause trouble so that Negro militancy is encouraged cannot be discounted.

On the other side white extremists in bodies like the Ku Klux Klan also put violence and fear at a premium. Although the Klan is only a shadow of the five-million-strong body of the 1920s, it is still a force to be reckoned with. In the words of Robert Shelton, the Imperial Wizard, the Klan aims to 'preserve our white Christian heritage'. It has as its targets not only Negroes but Jews and Catholics as well. In the South its power to use violence is enhanced by the fact that there is little likelihood of a conviction in a Southern court.

The Federal charge of 'conspiring to deprive of civil rights' which can be heard before a Federal court is the Administration's answer. The deaths of three civil rights workers in 1964 and the shooting of Mrs Liuzzo after the Selma march in 1965 show that the deterrent effect is not very strong. The Klan poses as the enemy of communism and represents itself as defending the American way of life. In fact its actions make propaganda for the communists and thus weaken America's position in the world.

The extremists on both wings do incalculable harm, but they represent only tiny minorities. The mass of white Americans are prepared to make concessions to the claim for Negro equality. Moderate Negro leaders, therefore, bear a great responsibility. Surveys show that 95 per cent of America's Negroes reject violence as a means of campaigning for civil rights. They reject the policies of the Black Muslims and other extreme groups, placing their faith in peaceful and legal processes.

A heavy burden rests on the shoulders of the leaders of moderate, progressive opinion. In their eagerness to press forward they have sometimes been too unselective in their membership. The Selma to Montgomery march was marred by acts of immorality and indecency by a minority of the demonstrators.

THE COLOUR PROBLEM ABROAD

These beatnik types should be purged from the ranks of organisations seeking public approval.

The links between the civil rights movement leaders and the Communist Party should also be clarified. The now famous photograph of Dr King at the Highlander Folk School in Monteagle, Tennessee, taken in 1957, shows him with three well-known communist leaders.

Charges of immorality and communist influence have never been properly answered. Many who wish the campaign for civil rights well would welcome clear and unequivocal replies to the accusations.

There is a danger that through the so-called non-violent demonstrations organised by moderate leaders the violence they oppose will be brought about. Non-violence is a misnomer. True, non-violent influences are public debate or recourse to the law. Non-violent demonstrations are, in fact, aimed at forcing the authorities to use violence first. Groups who defy the law by obstruction or illegal demonstrations are inviting violence. They create the situations in which extremism flourishes.

Any unbiased observer must agree with Archbishop Thomas Toolen who said that Dr King was 'trying to divide our people'. He also said: 'Demonstrations are not helping things at all.'

Other religious leaders echoed these sentiments. It was good to see churchmen speaking out so plainly but a pity that they were not so widely reported as were the stories of violence and race-hatred at Selma.

In a democracy differences should be settled by persuasion and discussion. It is unlikely that either side is completely right or entirely wrong, but 'passive resisters' close their eyes to any virtue in the opposing viewpoint. Those objectives which can be legally or morally claimed can be obtained through responsible public discourse. Only when unreasonable claims are made is the normal democratic process unlikely to bring success. Thus, those who make unreasonable demands seek to exploit the erroneous moral sentiment that he who first uses physical force is morally wrong in any clash of interests. The converse of this is that those

who abandon normal discussion as a way to settlement may be assumed to be making unreasonable or unacceptable demands. They are calling for total surrender from their opponents whose views are assumed to be totally wrong.

In the American situation there is room and opportunity for the accommodation of reasonable, moderate opposing views. The Negro case for civil rights is overwhelming.

The case of separateness cannot be argued for peoples imbued with the same culture and traditions. The Negro cause could well achieve full civil rights by reasoned discourse. If Negro leaders are seeking civil rights to be exercised in full freedom and equality they should abandon the policy of non-violent demonstration and passive resistance. Only if they are seeking something more do they need to employ these techniques leading to violence. A clear statement of aims coupled with an end to demonstrations would be the most valuable contribution to peaceful progress.

Once the fear of miscegenation is removed the white community is open to persuasion and violence is unnecessary. If the underlying sexual fear is allayed then equality in the economic and social fields can be assured. Negro leaders are in a position to reduce tension and hostility; they should grasp the opportunity. Otherwise extremists on both sides will gain support and the nation will be convulsed and riven with completely unnecessary racial strife. The moderate leaders should think deeply about their course of action which will be examined and judged by history.

Civil rights leaders must take care not to whip up emotion against imaginary ills. For example, the rioting in Los Angeles in August 1965 took place in a pleasant bungalow suburb. The Negroes in Southern California have long had full civil rights and education is desegregated. The agitator who points to the white man's greater affluence but does not remind his coloured audience of the economic plight of the 'poor white', creates a jealousy and envy which is easily sparked into violence.

It is significant that violence has erupted in regions away from the Deep South. When paternalism is swept away the fruits of

THE COLOUR PROBLEM ABROAD

freedom, direct competition with the white citizens, may well prove unexpectedly bitter. Those who imply that full civil rights will bring the millennium play into the hands of extremists like the Black Muslims. Calls for support for the oppressed in the future must be so phrased that they cannot be misinterpreted as incentives to strike at white people no matter how innocent. The white citizens of Los Angeles were not guilty of intolerance; the Negroes who destroyed and looted white property and assaulted white people in an orgy of violence and destruction were the racials. There is a lesson here for all to learn.

Maurice Evans in his book *Black and White in the Southern States* asks whether any white man will ever be able to understand the workings of the black man's mind and spirit. It will be a tragedy if, in the United States where black and white have the same cultural traditions, they cannot learn to understand each other. Nothing must be done to prevent the drawing together of Americans.

Extreme claims by Negroes, prejudiced hostility by whites and an unwillingness to compromise could lead to division and disaster. Though black and white will seek to keep their physical identity this must be individuality of the personality and not segregation of the races. Though equality is the aim it must not be at the expense of those who have sought to establish the highest standards for themselves and their families. An end to militancy and unreason will be a great step forward. If America can solve her racial problem then there is hope for just and peaceful solutions elsewhere.

There still remains much to do. Taking the United States as a whole, not just the South, we find that the 10 per cent of Americans who have black skins are still in bondage to their colour. A Negro is more likely to die at birth and more likely to grow up in poverty. More than 23 per cent of Negro babies are illegitimate. In Harlem the rate is 43 per cent. More Negroes are forced into crime and more end up in jail or in the electric chair. On average, Negroes receive three and a half years' less schooling and after leaving school one in five Negroes is unemployed. The

average income of a Negro family is less than half that of a white family and the gap is widening. Nearly 23 per cent of Negro women in the big cities are divorced, deserted or separated from their husbands. The Negro has an expectancy of life seven years less than that of a white person. This is the measure of the task remaining.

There is, however, progress in improving attitudes. The election of Roman Catholic President John F Kennedy was a victory for tolerance over entrenched reaction. More than half of American adults would now accept a well-qualified Negro as President. There is a steady reduction in the number of parents demanding strict segregation in the schools, though most white parents would still object strongly to their children being in the minority.

Progress must be slow even though the legal framework of equality is now erected. Much responsibility rests with the newspapers and with radio and television reporting. Highly emotional accounts of small incidents can destroy all the progress in race-relations made so painfully over the years. Never again should towns or districts be pilloried as Little Rock, Arkansas or Selma, Alabama, have been. Isolated events should not be given great prominence and in a peaceful atmosphere relationships will improve and extremists will find no encouragement.

Reporting should be fair and objective. One example of unfair reporting will have to suffice. The *Detroit News*, with banner headlines, featured the story that three Ministers were attacked on a Selma street. The same newspaper on the same day gave only a simple column heading to the news that a Negro gang stabbed nine white persons after a basketball game in Detroit itself. This imbalance must come to an end and newspapers and the other mass media must take up responsible positions on this explosive issue.

There is a right and a wrong way to achieve reform. Whatever the provocation, resort to passion and threats of violence lead only to 'mobocracy'. A cause is not righteous just because its followers hold highly publicised demonstrations. The sit-in is no

THE COLOUR PROBLEM ABROAD

greater contribution to racial harmony than the state trooper's club. The rule of reason is the right way, provocation to violence is the wrong way.

The United States is committed to the path of integration into a multi-racial society. By 1972, one-eighth of America's population will be Negro. They will be a majority in seven of the ten biggest cities in the United States—Chicago, Detroit, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, St Louis and Cleveland. Restraint internally and sympathy from outside are essential.

We in Britain can learn little from the history of race-relations in America except that violence begets violence and that even after centuries of cultural contact races remain divided. The lesson for us, surely, is that if America finds it so difficult to assimilate coloured people who are entirely American in outlook and upbringing, how much greater will be our task with people who are divided from us by the gulfs of culture and religion as well as of colour. When we look at America and ask if it is worth while to gain economic advantage at the expense of the creation of racial strife, surely the obvious answer is a resounding 'No!'

SOUTH AFRICA

Surely no country in the post-war world has been so widely condemned as South Africa. She has committed no aggression, her government is a model parliamentary democracy, she offers trade and friendship to all nations and her peoples are the most prosperous of the whole African continent. Why then the continued abuse, calumny and threats? Why was South Africa hounded from the Commonwealth? Why is there talk of economic boycott and threat of military intervention?

The answer lies in one word—apartheid. How strange it is that this word, describing one political solution to the race problem, is so abhorrent to so many people. There is every reason why people in one country should discuss and even criticise the policies of other nations, but in the case of South Africa there is no reasoned argument—just abuse.

Few of those who criticise South Africa have studied the

problems facing that country. Many of those to whom I have spoken are under the impression that South Africa's coloured population is an exploited, downtrodden minority. How surprised they are to learn that the white South Africans are outnumbered by four to one within the Republic and that the two and a half million whites are outnumbered by nearly fifty to one by the non-white nations stretching as far north as the Sahara Desert.

The fact that white people have lived in South Africa for roughly the same time as the Bantu is not often realised. This is not a case of white settlers seizing land from the natives—as the settlers did from the American Indians – but of white men from the South and black men from the North moving into the same territory. How amazingly peaceful has been this meeting of races when all this is considered.

It is as well to mention also that for the Bantu in South Africa standards of wages, pensions, welfare, education and hospitals are far better than in any independent black African state. Proportionately more black South Africans own motor-cars than do workers in the Soviet Union. Persecuted people flee from their persecutors but South Africa faces the problem not of flight but of mass entry from outside of those who would like to enjoy that country's opportunities.

South Africa with only 7 per cent of the population of the continent produces 40 per cent of the wealth. The *per capita* income of all South Africa's peoples is the highest in Africa – it exceeds the second best by more than 50 per cent. Expansion is the order of the day. Currently £300,000,000 is being spent to produce more steel, £200,000,000 to produce more electricity, £30,000,000 for more oil from coal and £225,000,000 has been earmarked for the Orange River Irrigation Hydro-Electric project.

South Africa's transport system is the most modern and comprehensive in Africa including the largest network of electrified railroads outside Europe and the United States. Nearly half of Africa's vehicles and telephones are in South Africa. South Africa has never received any foreign aid whatever, yet she always

THE COLOUR PROBLEM ABROAD

balances her national budget. Her foreign trade, excluding sales of gold, is worth £1,100,000,000 a year.

The balance of trade between Britain and South Africa is always in Britain's favour. In 1963 we sold goods worth £196,000,000 to South Africa. Her imports from Britain are rising rapidly. In 1963 she bought 40,000 British motor vehicles.

About half the traffic at Southampton docks is accounted for by trade with South Africa. The British share of foreign investment in South Africa is about £1,000,000,000, almost two-thirds of the total. In 1963 twelve thousand Britons emigrated to South Africa and formed the largest group of immigrants to that country. South Africa is a prosperous, friendly country, vital to our own economy and security.

All this being so why are not the facts more widely known to be used in discussion? Perhaps because the truth is too unfavourable to those who oppose South Africa for political reasons. Her critics do not want reasoned argument. They do not even appear willing to listen to it.

Let me quote an example – Trevor Huddleston writes in *Naught For Your Comfort*: 'What I shall try to avoid is that most common and persistent error in all such assessments – the attempt to be impartial.' From such critics we can hardly expect objective opinions.

What is so desperately needed is a meeting-point for South Africa and her critics. No political policy has a monopoly of moral rectitude. Any examination of South Africa's policies must include her problems and her achievements as well as her failures and mistakes.

A contributory reason for the lack of understanding of South Africa's case is the fact that the Press in the Republic is divided into English and Afrikaans. For historical reasons the opposition newspapers are almost all English, while the Government Press, except for the *Financial Gazette*, is Afrikaans. Since most of the would-be experts on South Africa in Fleet Street are unable to understand Afrikaans their information is limited to opposition media. The effect of this is to give a picture of the South African

Government about as accurate as that of the Labour Administration given by the *Daily Telegraph* or of Conservative Britain by the *Daily Mirror* – not intentionally inaccurate or misleading but hardly likely to give a well-rounded picture of the political situation.

South Africa has been known to the countries of Europe since the fifteenth century. It was long regarded as a staging-point to the East, of value only for its strategic position. The region was not seen as attractive in itself when compared with the lush riches of the Indies.

In 1652 the Dutch East India Company, rivalling the Portuguese in trade with the East, set up a fortified settlement. The need to protect the cattle and sheep on which the post depended for its food supply led to conflict with the Hottentots after 1659.

During the eighteenth century the settlement expanded and the Hottentots, decimated by smallpox and pneumonia, could offer little resistance. They became herdsmen in the pay of the Dutch but were always regarded as being a separate nation. Dutch law did not run outside the settlements though within such areas the Hottentots were strictly controlled.

Expansion northwards brought the Dutch into contact with the bushmen, who, as hunters, regarded the herds as fair game. Punitive expeditions almost exterminated them.

While the Dutch were slowly expanding to the north the virile and well-organised Bantu tribes were drifting southwards. In the fifteenth century they were in Zambesia and by the middle of the eighteenth century they were meeting the Dutch in the Eastern Cape. Attempts to fix a frontier in the European fashion with the Xhosa were unsuccessful and from 1778 conflict was frequent. The Kaffir Wars continued after the British occupied the Cape in 1806.

In 1819 the British made an abortive treaty with the Xhosa which again established the relationship as one between two nations. Sporadic conflict continued.

The 1830s saw the Great Trek of the Boers away from British rule. Natal was occupied, and when this was claimed as British the trek continued into the Transvaal and the Orange Free State.

THE COLOUR PROBLEM ABROAD

It was this large-scale movement which brought conflict with the Zulus, the most militaristic of the Bantu, and with the Matabele, an offshoot of the Zulu nation.

Before the 1870's there was little demand for labour other than for rural activities, but the discovery of diamonds and gold led to the construction of railways and a much greater demand for workers. Contract labour and even kidnapping were common.

The years 1899 to 1902 saw the two white races torn by internal conflict but the setback to expansion was only temporary. By 1904 the demand for labour was such that Chinese coolies were imported. Legislation strictly defined the jobs which 'coloured' workers might perform. At a later date Indian contract labour was also imported to add to the coloured labour force.

In Cape Province the intermixing of slaves from Madagascar with Hottentot women in the early days of settlement and with admixtures of European and Negro blood at a later stage produced the Cape Coloured community, a quite distinct and unique racial group.

An examination of South African history is of salutary importance. The basic conclusion is that the Bantu tribes, like the Hottentots before them, were always treated as separate nations. They have never been regarded as an integral part of one nation. Thus, any doctrine of racial integration is the 'new' proposal, while apartheid continues the principles of the past. The Protectorate status of Bechuanaland and Swaziland is a clear indication of this fundamental attitude. The South African Government aims to extend the policy to its logical conclusion in the Bantustans.

There never has been such a thing as one multi-racial South African nation, comprising seventeen million individuals, some of whom happen to be white and some of whom happen to be black. On the contrary, the South African population has always comprised – and comprises today – a variety of mutually distinctive peoples.

The 3,300,000 whites are not a group of random European

settler individuals. They are a nation in their own right, a nation inspired by its own nationalism – the first African nationalism on the continent to be granted its right to self-determination by Britain.

The Bantu population similarly still comprises a number of distinct peoples, such as the three and a half million Xhosas, and the three million Zulus. Each of these peoples in turn has a civilisation and heritage, including a language, of its own. History divided present-day South Africa into black and white homelands.

The crux of the South African situation is the question whether it is possible to fuse these various peoples into one South African nation, expressing itself through one set of institutions, including political institutions – a ‘multi-racial democracy’. The answer, surely, is no. No black African people has ever been interested in being pseudo-European. Their demand has been uncompromising – to give full and unfettered expression to the ‘African personality’, to be themselves and to run their affairs in their own way. Their way is not that of Europe, especially in politics and government. They invariably substitute an authoritarian form of government – even a one-party dictatorship – for the democratic institutions inherited from the colonial power concerned. This best suits their genius and their current stage of development. Multi-racial democracy is absolutely unacceptable to them.

If, therefore, a solution of multi-racialism is attempted in South Africa it would mean, as African realities show, rather sooner than later, an essentially African government for the whole country. That would, of course, be the end of the existence of the white nation as a separate political entity – such as they have been for many decades. This the white nation can never accept. They insist that self-determination, like liberty, must be indivisible. They cannot accept that it is just to applaud the birth of a new African nation, as long as it is inspired by black African nationalism, but at the same time to seek the end of an old nation, inspired by white African nationalism.

Thus the only fair policy in South Africa is one of separate development for the various peoples, guaranteeing, as it does,

THE COLOUR PROBLEM ABROAD

that none of these peoples will lord it over another. In terms of this policy there is no ceiling whatsoever – except their own ability – to the development of the various Bantu peoples, politically, economically and culturally. The policy of apartheid makes specific provision for the effective self-government and political independence of the Bantu peoples in their homelands. One of these peoples, the Xhosas of the Transkei, already have their own parliament. Even at this stage it has considerable administrative and legislative responsibility. The broad aim of apartheid is a commonwealth of peoples, each the master of its own political destiny, but all co-operating in matters of common concern.

The policy of apartheid does not aim at the Westernisation of African individuals. This they themselves find unacceptable. Rather does it aim at the civilisation of peoples in their national context. In the process of civilising whole peoples for effective freedom, more progress has been made in South Africa than anywhere else on the continent. Already more Bantu are having an active and real share in the running of their own affairs than anywhere else.

It is this prosperity and stability that South Africa is prepared to defend. The chaos, pillage and economic disasters of the rest of Africa are not for her.

What exactly is this policy of apartheid? It is a programme of separateness. Not of segregation in the sense of one race being inferior to another, but parallel and equal, though developing separately. Such a policy would probably be widely acceptable if it were not for the highly publicised views of a minority of South Africans, black and white, who claim that it is a programme of subjection for the Bantu.

Of course, there are people in South Africa who cling, for one reason or another, to outdated views of white superiority. Such people exist everywhere. The vast majority of South Africans are just as critical of them as are fair-minded people elsewhere.

Throughout this book I have sought to show that any doctrine which preaches the superiority of one race over another is specious, evil nonsense. Equally evil is the criticism of any

practical attempt to face up to racial problems. The parrot cry 'colour-bar' is the main weapon in the armoury of those who arrogantly claim that their policy of integration is the only one which must be considered.

These cries usually come from the extreme political Left, where there is a vested interest in winning the support of coloured people against the non-communist powers. South Africa appears as a bastion of Western Democracy in Africa and, as such, is anathema to communists and their fellow travellers. We in Britain should try to understand South Africa's problems even if we do not agree with her solutions. As Sir Derek Walker-Smith said at the time of South Africa's withdrawal from the Commonwealth, the South African Government is mortal and its successors may pursue different policies. What is lasting is the Union of South Africa, which should not have been lost to the Commonwealth because of political differences which may not endure.

Apartheid, if it could be separated from racialism, could well be an alternative solution to integration. South Africa's problem is quite different from that of the United States of America. American Negroes must be assimilated into full citizenship because they have no separate culture of their own. The Bantu are a number of proud, independent peoples, each with their own traditions and way of life. Only outsiders imagine that the Zulu and the Xhosa are one in culture. Each of the Bantu nations has a right to its own territory and its own development. This same privilege should surely be extended to the white South Africans whose urban society and rural communities are completely alien to the Bantu.

Those who call for complete integration into a multi-racial South Africa ignore the facts. They are unconsciously aligning themselves with the white extremists who echo the view of P Weale in *Conflict of Colour* when he says that 'Negroes have given nothing to the world, no nation, architecture, art, history or real religion, nothing enduring'. If one takes up this arrogant, white supremacist attitude then we may well say that the Bantu

THE COLOUR PROBLEM ABROAD

must integrate with white South Africans as they have nothing to lose. However, those who, like myself, believe fervently in the equality of all men will answer that if the Bantu has produced no evidence of a desire to progress towards a white man's ideal of civilisation, then he should be given the opportunity to develop his own form of society. He should be free from the pressures and compulsions of well-meaning but basically misguided people outside South Africa.

The first essential is a clear re-statement of policy by the South African Government. This should be absolutely unequivocal and should clearly define the objectives of apartheid as well as the means to the end. There should also be a firm statement of the absolute equality of all South Africa's citizens.

Commentators outside the Republic should then analyse the proposals without prejudice. To my mind, they would have to admit that for the Bantu there are enormous cultural and spiritual advantages in a policy of separate development. With international goodwill, except presumably from the communist countries and their allies, South Africa could then undertake this stupendous, unprecedented project which may well be the pattern for race-relations in the future in many parts of the world.

The Bantu it is true has no monument to his past in the shape of great cities, but if the individuality of each nation is retained then the richness of diversity will flourish. Who are we to claim that European civilisation with its economic and social pressures is the highest achievement of mankind? In a simpler, less competitive environment the spiritual values may well develop more freely than at present. Certainly no Bantu society is likely to seek to threaten the very existence of mankind as does the military potential of our allegedly superior civilisation.

A policy of separate development has the support of an increasing majority of white South Africans. It is also favoured by many non-whites. I had the opportunity to discuss South Africa's problems with the leader of the Cape Coloured community, Dr Golding, during his visit to Britain in 1963. Over lunch he expressed surprisingly moderate views. He did not completely reject

the Nationalist Government and all its works. He was critical but understanding.

Much emotional nonsense has been talked about South Africa. Father Huddleston 'wept because of the Western Area Removal Scheme'. Slum clearance always causes some inconvenience but the Sophiatown area of Johannesburg was a monument to unplanned industrial housing. A shanty town, lacking the most basic sanitary and social amenities, it had grown up to house the mass of immigrant labour working in the mines and the city. The disease-ridden slum was razed to the ground and the people transferred to Meadowlands, a model rehousing scheme with new modern bungalows, eleven schools, twenty-seven nurseries, thirty-eight churches, a public health centre, cinemas, shops, markets, community centres and 125 acres of parkland. One can understand communist agitators 'weeping' for lost opportunities but why, Father Huddleston, why you?

Unprejudiced observers have noted similar progress elsewhere in South Africa. In the past ten years more than £100,000,000 has been spent to provide homes and essential services for the Bantu. This has meant the building in that period of the equivalent of six cities each the size of Southampton.

Mr A Baker, Head of Rotary International, said in 1956 of the new non-white township outside Fort Elizabeth for 35,000 people: 'Flowers, trees and sparkling cleanliness make it a joy to behold.' Credit is reflected on the South African Government for their efforts and on the Bantu themselves for making such a success of their new townships.

Clearly, many Bantu will choose to live and work away from the Bantustans for lengthy periods. If they do, such townships as these will prevent the slum conditions which arise when immigrant labour is taken in without proper provision being made.

The South African Government is spending some £57,000,000 a year on schemes to help the development of the Bantu peoples. The most modern hospital in Africa, the Welkom Hospital costing £750,000, is for the exclusive benefit of the Bantu.

THE COLOUR PROBLEM ABROAD

Two fields of criticism of the South African Government's policy have been the Pass Laws and the Bantu Education Act. Why there should be such resentment outside South Africa about the carrying of passes is not clear. In France identification documents have to be carried. In Jamaica immigrant workers must carry a pass. Some check seems necessary against a flood of illiterate unemployed from surrounding territories seeking to take advantage of the higher standard of living in South Africa. No alternative is ever suggested by the critics.

The Bantu Education Act was necessary because the Churches could not possibly pay for all education of the Bantu. The Government's payments meant that the educational system could be adapted to fit in with the long-term national policy of separate development.

Current school enrolment of Bantu pupils is about 1,800,000. Each year there are 100,000 more pupils. There are 29,000 Bantu teachers working in 8,300 schools backed by forty-eight Bantu teacher training colleges with an enrolment of almost 4,000.

* Some 2,000 Bantu students are now receiving university training. Bantu have already entered most professions. There are at least seventy Bantu doctors, seventy librarians, fifty attorneys, 8,000 nurses and a number of university lecturers.

Bantu education, obviously, should serve Bantu development. No other coloured Africans have such a comprehensive educational system. There are already 3,000 Bantu graduates in South Africa, almost twice as many as in Black Africa. It is a pity that such a distorted picture has been given to the world outside.

Protests against the misrepresentation of the Act, such as that made by the Reverend J B Webb, President of the Conference of the Methodist Church of South Africa against the BBC in 1955, have gone almost unnoticed. Under the programme of separate development the Bantu is to serve the Bantu. The Education Act is aimed at self-realisation for the Bantu rather than the imposition of a veneer of alien European culture. Today four out of five Bantu between the ages of seven and twenty-one are literate. Within the next generation all Bantu will be literate. By contrast,

four out of every five of all people in the rest of Africa are illiterate today.

Basically South Africa has to decide between three mutually exclusive solutions of her racial problem. Some decision is needed to prevent chaos. The possibilities are withdrawal, assimilation, or separation. Withdrawal is impossible. The white South Africans are Africans. They have nowhere else to go. Therefore a solution must be found within South Africa's boundaries. Assimilation would mean the extinction of the white population as a cultural entity. They have contributed so much in initiative, enterprise and dynamism to South Africa that their interests must be safeguarded. Separate development offers all the advantages of close contact while protecting the weaker elements from unrestricted competition.

Abraham Lincoln saw that the Negro needed some protection from the competitive nature of European institutions. This great lover of freedom said: 'Even when you cease to be slaves, you are yet far removed from being on an equality with the white man. It is better for us both to be separated.' In America the time for separation is nearly over. In South Africa it will be an enduring feature because separate development will lead to the parallel growth of societies which will have a lasting pride in their individualities.

The areas set aside for the Bantu are already bigger than England for a population less than that of London. The Transkei has set out on the road to be followed by other Bantustans. Probably the British protectorates will follow a similar pattern. Bechuanaland is already seeking closer relations with South Africa.

In the Bantu homelands more than 6,600 men already serve their own communities on 500 local councils. Territorial assemblies with local powers have already been constituted for most of South Africa's Bantu peoples. The Xhosa of the Transkei have full internal self-government. In the Bantu townships surrounding major cities and towns local government is being transferred into the hands of the Bantu themselves.

THE COLOUR PROBLEM ABROAD

Professor Laubscher has written that the Bantu, far from being inferior, is superior in his own sphere; he is only inferior in the European sphere. This augurs well for the Bantustans. They may well quickly leave behind the ramshackle, independent republics of black Africa in economic development, social progress and political stability.

South Africa is faced with a threat of communist subversion inspired from outside her borders. That she remains a democracy and wedded to the rule of law is greatly to her credit. She is a vital ally in the struggle to preserve Western civilisation and it is a tragedy that she is isolated from her natural friends by a wall of misunderstanding. New efforts are needed to bring about closer relations. In this South Africa must play her part by publicly clearing away misconceptions of her policies. Other nations must then try to understand her peculiar problems and offer sympathy to her peoples as they seek a just and equitable solution.

It is probable that no amount of goodwill from South Africa would convince her enemies of the rightness of her policy. The effort, however, is well worth making. If, after all, disagreements remain, then they should be treated as disagreements among friends, to be discussed rationally and with due regard for national sovereignty. If other nations dislike our social system they are free to criticise, but they are most certainly not at liberty to seek to interfere or to subvert.

Proposals to use diplomatic or economic sanctions against South Africa are a gross interference with her internal affairs. They would help only the communists and would harm the poorest section of the community most. Thus the greatest sufferers would be the Bantu whom the advocates of sanctions claim to be seeking to help.

Despite highly publicised incidents there is much goodwill between the races in South Africa. Even Father Huddleston tells of the aid he received from white individuals and firms for his charitable projects among the Bantu. This internal goodwill may be destroyed by outside interference. It would be a tragedy for

Africa and for the world as a whole if the South African experiment was to fail. The alternative is a Congo-type situation of bloodshed, massacre and reversion to savagery. The South African Government is determined not to let this happen.

In this endeavour they should have our support. Increased trade does not imply unquestioning acceptance of the apartheid principle. Close friendship does not mean that we cannot, on occasion, criticise. On the contrary, our influence would be all the greater as a positive friend. All those who wish to see a peaceful solution to Africa's problems should wish South Africa well. So should all who look forward to the eventual happy settlement of the difficulties arising from race-relations. South Africa's solution is not the only answer, but as a genuine attempt to find a practical way of settling problems in one area, it deserves to be given every opportunity to succeed.

In any case, the West cannot afford to see South Africa fall under communist domination. The Republic produces two-thirds of the free world's gold and most of its diamonds, chrome, platinum and antimony. South Africa produces 43 per cent of Africa's total manufactures and is a source of uranium. She produces vast quantities of agricultural products and has a potential almost limitless in its possibilities. Her strategic position is of vital importance and is the key to the control of Africa as a whole.

South Africa has no choice but to face her racial problems. Her chosen way – separate development – offers a peaceful solution. We in Britain, a tiny, overcrowded island, cannot take the same course internally, but could we not look to separate development – each in his own country among his own people – as an external solution? With goodwill and mutual aid such a proposal could well be the answer in the long run to the whole of mankind's racial problem.

RHODESIA

Rhodesia faces problems similar in many ways to those of South Africa but made more difficult by political and constitutional uncertainties. The great economic progress of Rhodesia is entirely

THE COLOUR PROBLEM ABROAD

due to European initiative and enterprise. In the days of Cecil Rhodes the King's kraal at Bulawayo was a hut of mud and wood floored with cow-dung. Today Rhodesia has fine cities, roads, hospitals and schools. Its industries and agriculture are prosperous. The future, if outside interference is eliminated, is bright for both white and coloured citizens.

The population of Rhodesia is about four million, of whom somewhat less than 10 per cent are Europeans. Most of the white population is of British stock. In 1923 Southern Rhodesia became a self-governing colony second only to South Africa in political development. It was always accepted that while Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland might become black African independent states in the course of time, Southern Rhodesia which had been built up by white men would remain a country in which Europeans would retain a controlling interest. The idea of handing over the country to an African majority was utterly foreign to the thought of anyone in Southern Rhodesia.

The possibility of a partnership between the races, based on a Federation of the Rhodesias and Nyasaland, was canvassed for many years. The short life of the Federation which was formed in 1953 shows the fundamental impracticability of the idea. The aims of the Africans and the Europeans diverged too widely for permanent agreement. What was so amazing and so unjust was that while full independence was granted to Zambia (Northern Rhodesia) and Malawi (Nyasaland) with almost indecent haste, the same freedom was denied to the politically more advanced and economically more viable Southern Rhodesia.

The relations between Africans and Europeans in Rhodesia are, on the whole, perfectly friendly. The standard of living is rising steadily as industry and agriculture develop. There are no arbitrary laws of racial separation as in South Africa, though of course social segregation is traditional. Land has been set aside for the use of each community and the educational provisions for Africans are the equal of the best elsewhere in the continent.

Rhodesia covers an area about three times as large as England.

Some 21 per cent is over 4,000 feet above sea-level. The high veld, or central plateau, has climatic conditions well suited to European settlement.

This part of Africa was visited by the Portuguese in the sixteenth century but Britain's first contact was through Livingstone's explorations in the 1850's. The good farmland of the high veld and the minerals, especially gold, of Mashonaland attracted European interest. The Matabele, who dominated much of the territory, granted a monopoly of mineral rights to Cecil Rhodes' emissary in 1888.

The British South Africa Company was formed in 1889 to exploit the concession. Its aim was to 'promote trade, commerce, civilisation and good government'. Mashonaland was occupied in 1890, and in 1898, after the Matabele War, it was joined to Matabeleland to form Southern Rhodesia. Until 1923 the region was administered by the British South Africa Company whose Royal Charter was to run for twenty-five years. The Legislative Council increasingly represented the settlers. In 1914, when the Charter expired, it was renewed for a further ten years, but by 1917 there was an unofficial majority on the Legislative Council, and in 1920 a resolution was passed calling for responsible government.

At the Referendum of 1922 a majority of voters chose the course of becoming a self-governing colony in preference to joining the Union of South Africa. In 1923 Rhodesia was annexed to the Crown and given full internal self-government. The British Government retained certain reserved powers affecting African interests and constitutional amendment.

A series of conferences was held in 1951, 1952 and 1953 with the aim of linking the Rhodesias and Nyasaland, and the Federation was brought into existence in 1953. African opposition, especially in the Northern territories, led to its break-up in 1963 when Zambia and Malawi became independent and Rhodesia reverted to the status of a self-governing colony under the Constitution of 1961.

Land in Rhodesia has been apportioned between the races.

THE COLOUR PROBLEM ABROAD

About a quarter of the total is set aside as Native Reserves. Here land is held in common by the tribes. A rather larger area is available for African use for purchase on individual terms. At present 44,240,000 acres out of a total of 96,600,000 acres are reserved exclusively for Africans.

The number of Africans in primary schools has trebled since 1948 while the number of secondary pupils has grown from 327 to 11,500 in the same period. Technical education, vocational training and teacher training are also expanding rapidly. Seven hundred and fifty students are in full-time courses at the University College, a multi-racial institution.

Politics in Rhodesia are conditioned by events beyond her frontiers. The resistance of South Africa and Portugal to outside pressures encourages resistance in Rhodesia to the demands for advancement towards a coloured electoral majority. The example of the Congo is clearly in the minds of the white settlers.

The educational qualification for enrolment as an elector in Rhodesia is precisely the same for all races. In a highly developed economy it is essential that control, political and economic, should be vested in the most competent hands.

Good relations with South Africa and the Portuguese territories are essential to a land-locked country dependent on its neighbours for rail and seaport outlets.

The 1961 Constitution provided for the representation of the Crown by a Governor assisted by an Executive Council, which consists of the Cabinet. It established a single chamber Legislative Assembly. A Constitutional Council, a multi-racial judicial body, was set up to examine legislation to ensure that it does not contravene the Declaration of Rights. The Declaration corresponds closely to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations. Its purpose is 'to ensure that every person in Southern Rhodesia enjoys the fundamental rights and freedoms of the individual, that is to say, the right, whatever his race, tribe, place of origin, political opinions, colour or creed, but subject to respect for the rights and freedoms of others and for the public interest, to each and all of the following, namely:

- (a) life, liberty, security of the person, the enjoyment of property and protection of the law;
- (b) freedom of conscience, of expression, and of assembly and association; and
- (c) respect for his private and family life.'

The franchise provided for fifty constituencies and for fifteen electoral districts. Two electoral rolls, A and B, were established. The A roll, with higher qualifications, is basically for use in the constituencies, while the B roll is mainly for the electoral districts. In the constituencies the B roll votes cast cannot count as more than 25 per cent of the A roll votes. In the electoral districts a similar rule applies in reverse.

If Africans registered fully they would represent 75 per cent of the B roll and 10 per cent of the A roll. To gain a parliamentary majority they would need to gain some 40 per cent of the A roll votes in at least eighteen constituencies as well as the whole fifteen seats from the electoral districts. As educational opportunities increase more Africans become eligible for A roll registration. The Constitution provided for a gradual process of change. It created the conditions for a developing democracy without revolution.

Unfortunately, the African Nationalist leaders have persistently refused to make use of the democratic process. By persuasion, threats, intimidation and violence they prevented more than three-quarters of the African electors from voting between 1962 and 1965. Their demands are for 'one man – one vote' regardless of the consequences. Their intransigent attitude makes Rhodesia's problems still more difficult.

Britain has given up her reserve powers under the 1923 Constitution but proposals to amend the Constitution, or certain entrenched clauses, need a two-thirds majority in the Assembly and the agreement of the four principal racial groups – European, African, Asian and Coloured – voting separately in a referendum. Alternatively, the matter could be referred to the United Kingdom Government without the referendum.

At the election on 7th May 1965 Mr Ian Smith's Rhodesian

THE COLOUR PROBLEM ABROAD

Front Government gained fifty seats out of the sixty-five, thus obtaining the necessary majority for constitutional change. Six months later the Rhodesian Government declared itself to be independent – on 11th November 1965. This was a great and sad step for Rhodesia to take but successive British governments have refused to offer Rhodesia independence on the basis of the 1961 Constitution.

Ian Douglas Smith is Rhodesia's first Rhodesian-born Prime Minister.

He was born in 1919 in Selukwe, the little mining town in Rhodesia's Midlands near which he still lives. His father, John Douglas (Jock) Smith, came to Rhodesia in 1898 as a young man, from Hamilton, Scotland. He settled in Selukwe, where he acquired widespread business interests, in farming, gold-mining, a motor garage and the meat and bakery trade. He was a member of the first Village Management Board for Selukwe and was awarded the MBE for his services to local government. Mr Smith first went to school in Selukwe and later attended Chaplin school, Gwelo, where he had a fine record. After leaving school Mr Smith went to Rhodes University, Grahamstown, where he graduated as a Bachelor of Commerce. While at Rhodes University he was Senior Student in his Hall and Chairman of the Students' Representative Council.

Mr Smith joined the RAF in 1941, and served with distinction until 1946, reaching the rank of flight lieutenant. After the war Mr Smith returned to farm near Selukwe, and now owns a 4,500-acre farm and a 6,000-acre ranch, cattle being the most important of his farming activities.

Mr Smith was first elected to the Legislative Assembly in 1948 as a member of the Rhodesia Party. He was elected to the Federal Parliament in 1953 and became Chief Government Whip in 1958, but in 1961 he resigned from the United Federal Party after he had voted against the Southern Rhodesia constitutional proposals.

He was a foundation member of the Rhodesian Front, was elected to the Southern Rhodesia Legislative Assembly in 1962

and appointed Minister of the Treasury. He became Prime Minister on 13th April 1964.

He is not the sort of man to be intimidated by threats by Left-wing politicians in London or by the African Nationalists.

Rhodesia has a small but effective army and air force and an efficient police service. She could probably count on the political support of South Africa and Portugal in any conflict with her black African neighbours.

The white Rhodesians have demonstrated an overwhelming support for the Rhodesian Front Government. They feared that protracted negotiations over independence would only have further increased the political power of the African Nationalists.

The African Nationalists are divided among themselves. The Reverend Sithole's Zimbabwe African Union and Mr Joshua Nkomo's People's Caretaker Council are in conflict which has led to bloodshed. Only by resort to intimidation and violence have they managed to prevent Africans from voting for moderate candidates at elections. The leaders lack administrative experience and by boycotting democratic processes are failing to obtain experience in government.

Traditional African opinion is reflected by the Council of Chiefs. At Indabas held at Domboshawa in 1964 and 1965 the Chiefs indicated their full and unreserved support for the Government's call for immediate independence. The Chiefs, whose appointments are not in the hands of the Government, saw independence as the only alternative to domination by the Nationalists. They have frequently reiterated that they represent the African people much more closely than do the Nationalists who depend on naked violence to obtain a following.

Throughout the period of British relations with Rhodesia the Chiefs have been accepted as representative of African opinion. In 1960 the Monckton Commission endorsed the Rhodesian Government's policy of restoring the traditional authority of the Chiefs.

The Domboshawa Indaba of 1964 was held in the traditional tribal manner. The issue of independence was discussed for five

THE COLOUR PROBLEM ABROAD

days until a unanimous agreement was reached. This was a meeting meaningful to Africans who know little and care less for European notions of politics. The Chiefs showed great courage, since they were subjected to personal threats from the Nationalists should they support the independence proposals.

Besides calling for independence the Chiefs suggested that they should have a voice in Parliament and that steps should be taken to preserve the tribal cultures. They drew attention to the fact that it was they who had called upon their peoples to support the Crown in 1914 and again in 1939. They should speak for the Africans on the Constitutional issue.

Anyone reading their speeches must be impressed by their sincerity and moderation compared with the irresponsible calls to violence issued by the Nationalists. Between them the Government and the Chiefs represent the mass of opinion in Rhodesia which prefers peaceful progress to bloody revolution. The Rhodesian Government now proposes to bring the Chiefs into the work of governing the country. This should prove a most valuable experiment.

There is a great opportunity in Rhodesia to create a new relationship between races. If the present goodwill can be retained then Rhodesia can become the model for Africa. The threats are from reactionaries both white and black. The Constitutional issue must not be allowed to drift or extremists will gain ground. The British Government should have indicated its willingness to negotiate the granting of immediate independence to Rhodesia on the basis of the 1961 Constitution.

Rhodesia cherishes Cecil Rhodes' formula – 'equal rights for all civilised men' – and within her boundaries all races can develop freely. Black nationalism does not aim at partnership but at the domination of the whole continent. We must not lightly cast aside the loyalty of Rhodesians so recently demonstrated in war, in order to placate those who have no understanding of compromise.

In Rhodesia the possibilities of separate development are immense. There is no need for the apparatus of apartheid since the

physical conditions already exist. People of different races will be able to develop their own cultures within the framework of a prosperous modern nation.

The lesson for us in Britain is that relations between a white community and coloured races can be perfectly amicable as long as the social structure of each society is retained. There is no unrest on the tribal reserves except that caused by the intimidation of loyal tribesmen by urbanised African politicians. We should heed the warning against seeking to impose European social and political ideas on other races. The inevitable result is bitterness and frequently violence.

Rhodesia is a bastion against the southward drive of the forces of communism and black nationalism. Those who value the defence of Western ideals should give their active support to Rhodesia. All should join in pressing both London and Salisbury to enter into immediate negotiations to work out a just, equitable and lasting settlement. The use of force against Rhodesia in any circumstances should be publicly renounced, and this fortress of civilisation in a continent drifting towards anarchy and savagery should be enthusiastically aided on the road to full nationhood.

By our studies of South Africa and Rhodesia we come to see the germ of the solution to racial tension. If races develop separately in their own ways, they do not clash in competition but can co-operate in harmony. Only when the African is pressed into the urbanised European society of the city does he become an active revolutionary. The African on the tribal reserve in Rhodesia, or in the Transkei, sees the government of his country as the welcome source of peace and order. Political parties and the paraphernalia of government as we know them are alien to African culture which is none the worse – nor even the less democratic – for being different.

Aid from European sources to Africa should aim at improving health, education and control of the environment. African communities may also need help in the development of industries to create the reserves of capital necessary for schemes of social advancement. If outside aid is not to become interference then the

THE COLOUR PROBLEM ABROAD

pattern in Rhodesia and South Africa of native communities living in their own ways, but linked to technologically experienced European communities, is to be encouraged in the regions where such conditions exist. This gives the benefits of integration without the overwhelming disadvantages which usually accompany attempts to enforce it.

We in Britain have not the space nor yet the need to follow the patterns of Rhodesia and South Africa within our own islands, but our Commonwealth links enable us to help other societies to develop in their own lands. Overseas aid and the services of experts in the development of natural resources should be our contributions. Immigration should be discouraged because those who would come here are vitally needed at home. The under-developed countries cannot spare skilled personnel and we have no need of the unskilled. Immigration is therefore no answer. International co-operation should be the programme for Britain and for the Commonwealth.

GERMANY

The experience of other industrial countries in absorbing immigrants could be valuable. West Germany has accepted about a million foreign workers since the end of the war. Most of these are only temporary residents seeking to build up a bank balance, gain industrial training and know-how and then return home.

The Federal Republic is also playing a part in the training of technicians from Asia and Africa for work in their own countries. The German universities have numerous coloured students and the Technological University at Aachen has made a notable contribution in the training of technologists from overseas.

A number of large industrial firms have also undertaken the training of foreign technicians, particularly for work in subsidiary companies overseas, or in factories built by German firms for African or Asian concerns. The Federal Government ensures that trainees return home after completing their training.

A major difference compared with immigration into Britain is that Germany's new arrivals, other than students and trainees,

are practically all Europeans, and many have come only a relatively short distance. The return journey represents no great financial hardship. Britain's immigrants, on the other hand, have come many thousands of miles and find return prohibited by cost.

Most of Germany's immigrants come from other countries which have growing industries and developing social services. Thus the return home is likely to lead to continued employment and similar social benefits. Our Commonwealth immigrants, however, would return to countries where there is under-employment and where they would lose such benefits as holidays with pay, sickness, birth and death benefits and children's allowances.

Germany has absorbed some two million East Germans. The other million come from Holland, Austria, Italy, Spain, Turkey and Greece. The Dutch and Austrians, who number some 120,000, are similar in language and way of life to the local population. They fit easily into German society. The large Italian population of over 300,000 is distinguished by language, but there has been much contact between the two peoples, dating back to the Axis alliance. The 161,000 Spaniards have not found it quite so easy to adapt themselves, but there is little or no difficulty once the language barrier is broken down.

There are some 50,000 Yugoslavs in West Germany. Most of these speak some German before entering since the northern part of that country was until quite recently under Austrian domination. German was, and remains, a common language, particularly in industry and commerce. Only the 107,000 Turks have really remained outside the German social fabric. They have a different religion, social background and dietary habits. As in Britain these barriers between peoples remain unbroken. However, there is a world of difference between Germany's 100,000 and our million unassimilated immigrants. Germans are amazed at our patience and indulgence in accepting so large a number of coloured workers, though they too occasionally have their problems, as when a Turkish immigrant worker named Ali, who has several wives at home, claimed children's allowances for his thirty-three children! The allowance claimed was twice as high as his salary!

THE COLOUR PROBLEM ABROAD

Germany has shown that it is possible to increase the working population by immigration without creating a racial problem. The key is the recruitment of people who are likely to fit easily into the host society. Practically all of Germany's immigrants are of European stock. They do not stand out as different and are clearly only temporary residents. Permits for dependants are only given if suitable accommodation is available. As a result of this over 80 per cent of Germany's immigrants are workers making a direct contribution to the economy of the Federal Republic.

The majority of foreign workers are recruited by the Federal Bureau for Employment in response to direct requests from employers. For example, new agreements with Portugal and Morocco allow recruiting as and when the need arises. Consequently immigrants do not arrive in Germany without a job but with a firm offer of employment. We certainly have much to learn from the Germans in this field.

HOLLAND

The Dutch have encouraged immigration from their former empire to Holland. The numbers coming from Indonesia, Surinam and other territories have been proportionately much higher than immigration into Britain. Integration has been reasonably successful though there have been instances of friction.

The Dutch Government assists immigrants with their passages and accommodates and clothes them on arrival. They receive an allowance during industrial training and official help in finding jobs and homes. Of all new housing 5 per cent is reserved for immigrants. There is a strict medical examination before departure but otherwise there are no barriers to entry and no restrictions on immigrants once they have settled in as citizens.

Why has the arrival of 350,000 immigrants in a small country like Holland caused so little difficulty? There appear to be a number of special circumstances. First, many of those from Indonesia are racially half-Dutch and culturally completely

European. They have the advantage of being regarded as refugees from Sukarno's régime. This creates public sympathy.

The integration of the pure-bred Ambonesians has been far less successful and they remain a quite separate group. Immigrants from Surinam have been criticised in the Press for precisely the same reasons that immigrants are criticised everywhere else, for lack of cleanliness, for overcrowding and for unwillingness to work.

There have been many complaints in Amsterdam of knife fights and other violence. Drug-peddling as a sideline to the formation of small jazz orchestras in such ports as Rotterdam and Amsterdam is also reported.

It is alleged that management of the houses in the Bergstraat, the red-light area of old Amsterdam, has been almost completely taken over by Surinamese. These complaints are played down by the Dutch Press at the request of the Government which fears that organisations among immigrants, such as 'Our Surinam', may complain to their home governments and create conditions for the break-up of the remainder of the Dutch Empire.

The Dutch have done well in integrating their immigrants, though not as well as is sometimes suggested. Special circumstances have helped but the main lesson for us is that government aid is vital. Financial help to local authorities in Britain would permit them to carry out programmes on the Dutch model. We have failed to integrate our immigrants because we have left the task to local councils, voluntary bodies and to chance. Massive government help in housing, education, industrial training and settlement is an urgent and immediate necessity.

SWITZERLAND

Switzerland is an amalgam of three major European cultures and languages. Racial prejudice has always been negligible. Now, more than a third of the labour force is made up of foreigners. There are about 800,000, two-thirds of whom are Italians. Most of the immigrants are temporary residents rather than settlers in the permanent sense, but resentment against them has been

THE COLOUR PROBLEM ABROAD

growing. In 1965 the Swiss Government ordered a reduction of 5 per cent of foreign workers except in the building industry.

A major complaint is that the remittances of the Italian workers, running at some 1,500,000 Swiss francs a year, adversely affect the balance of payments. It is also claimed that the cheap labour reduces incentives to labour-saving in industry. This is leading to higher costs. The Swiss complain that crowded school conditions are leading to lower educational standards and that a large foreign minority is a strategic danger.

These are arguments which could well be applied to the British immigration problem. The Swiss have the advantage, however, that they have not granted permanent residence permits to many of the foreign workers. They can therefore reduce the numbers if they wish. The situation is also easier since the immigrants are Europeans who can quite quickly adapt themselves to Swiss society.

Few of the immigrant workers have their dependants with them since this is discouraged by the Swiss immigration legislation. Many of the foreign workers are seasonal migrants. The Swiss Government's action to restrict immigration has reduced the flow though the trend is still upwards. Individual employers have to apply to the cantonal authorities for a work permit for each foreigner they wish to employ. Permits are granted only after consideration by a committee representing employers and the trades unions. Since 1963 the committees have had to take into account the Federal Government's policy of granting entry only if there has been a decrease in the numbers employed by a concern. Entrants are subjected to a medical examination before a permit is granted.

Switzerland's difficulties with European migrants are a warning to us with our much less readily-assimilated immigrant population.

COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Communists frequently accuse others of racial prejudice. Russia and China pose as the champions of the oppressed in their struggle

against imperialism. China in particular has meddled in race-relations, pointing to her own non-white status as a link with other coloured races.

The experience of coloured residents in communist countries has not been uniformly happy. While communism makes much play of its opposition to any form of racial prejudice, students and others have found rigid colour-bars in the Peoples' Democracies. In Peking students have found themselves strictly segregated from Chinese society. Girls with whom they have struck up acquaintance have 'disappeared'. Chinese students have treated Africans with gross discourtesy and regarded them as barbarians.

Many students returning from communist countries after completing courses of training have expressed themselves forcibly about the racial prejudice which they have experienced. Asians and Africans complain of restrictions on personal travel and lack of freedom for student organisations. They found colour prejudice of the crudest kind.

Racial discrimination is outlawed by the Russian legal code but recent reports indicate that the coloured students in the USSR meet with prejudice of the most violent kind. In December 1963 African students petitioned Mr Khrushchev, the then Prime Minister, asking him to 'guarantee that our lives will be safe in the Soviet Union'.

Official discouragement of liaisons between Russian girls and African students was recently illustrated by the cautionary tale in *Komsomolskaya Pravda* which told of a Russian girl's life after marriage to an African. Her fate was to be sold into a harem. Such a fictional story in an official organ can only be interpreted as sanctioning prejudice. Not that Russian discouragement is confined to coloured students only – a Russian girl who was engaged to marry a Swedish teacher lost her job, was questioned by police who told her she was 'too fond of foreigners', and was finally sentenced to five years' imprisonment for 'a parasitic and anti-social way of life'.

Recent reports have given the information that Africans have

THE COLOUR PROBLEM ABROAD

died mysteriously in Tiflis and Kiev. Any African risks trouble who enters the Gorki Amusement Park and is virtually certain to be attacked if he is accompanied by a Russian girl.

Similar reports of unrest among coloured students in other communist countries in Eastern Europe indicate that the communist system does not get rid of racial prejudice. People react similarly regardless of their political creeds.

It is almost impossible to find an example of peoples of clearly defined different races living harmoniously within one country without strict separation. Greeks and Turks are open enemies in Cyprus. Negro and Arab are in conflict in the Sudan. Indians and Negroes clash in Mauritius and British Guiana. Clearly this is not just a problem existing between white and coloured communities. Peter Thorneycroft wisely said in March 1965: 'The clash comes when there is a clash of cultures in a particular country. It is not necessarily a matter of colour. It happens in East Africa today, in a clash between the black Africans and the Indians. It happens in Malaysia between the Malay proper and the Chinese. . . . It happens in Fiji, in British Guiana and it is to be found in South Africa and in the United States of America. We are not alone in facing problems of this character. Nor are they necessarily problems which are black and white.'

Colour is not the cause of the rivalries and animosities which persist between the peoples of India and Pakistan. Nor is it true to say that black men have suffered oppression solely at the hands of white men. In Ceylon the Tamils still protest bitterly that they are treated as second-class citizens who are forbidden to speak and write in their own language. In Ghana black men are imprisoned for indefinite periods without trial by other black men. In the Congo there have been wholesale massacres of black men by people of their own colour.

The complex nature of such racial problems is illustrated by the difficulties in multi-racial Malaysia. The Malay and Chinese communities have much in common but there were frequent

charges of racialism levelled by Singapore's Chinese against the Malay Federal Government before the break-away.

The bustling Chinese control much of Malaysia's commerce and are a dominant majority in Singapore itself. The Malays, the largest single racial group in Malaysia, are less inclined to energetic work but have kept political control. The two groups became incompatible and Singapore's secession from the Federation was an acknowledgement of this fact.

There are so many clear examples warning countries against the folly of attempting to build multi-racial societies at the present stage of human development. For the moment those nations which have no racial minorities should be thankful and show sympathy towards those who are faced with such problems. The lesson is clear. If immigrant workers are needed, then they should be chosen to fill specific vacancies and be selected from among groups likely to be easily assimilated.

Where there are racial groups clearly separated from the majority, every effort should be made to help them to develop their own cultures, and their rights should be established by law. Those countries which cannot do this will need to tread the stony path through many decades of problems and difficulties. Britain must decide her policy, duly considering the legacy of the present to the future. If we deliberately create here the conditions prevailing in the United States of America what will be the verdict of future generations?

Immigration – A Vital Political Issue

IN 1966 there are a million coloured immigrants in Britain. This number will increase quite rapidly to some four million by the end of the century. How far are these new citizens a part of the society in which they live? What contribution are they making socially and economically? What is the cost of their presence to the community? Can they be assimilated as were previous immigrant groups? Can they become Britons? Do they wish to do so?

Many immigrants have made considerable sacrifices to come to Britain. They may have expended life savings or put themselves into almost ruinous debt for a single air ticket. The life they left behind was relatively peaceful and tranquil. Since the very poor cannot afford to emigrate, usually their living conditions were reasonably comfortable in a warm, pleasant climate. They have given up all this in a search for greater economic security, more ready cash and greater opportunities for social advancement.

They find grey streets beneath a smoky sky, a chill climate and a cool reception from the British people. Wages are often much lower than they expected and rents very much higher. For many the first contact with white people in any numbers is an uninspiring experience. Almost certainly they will go through a period of intense disappointment, though this usually passes quite quickly as they learn to accommodate themselves to their new surroundings.

One of their first ambitions if they are Indian or West Indian is to arrange for their families to join them. When this is done they feel more rooted and secure. Next they will seek to improve

their living conditions, Indians and Pakistanis by buying property, West Indians by brightening up their drab apartments with new furniture, a television set and a record player.

Family increases make return home less likely as the extra tickets would be very costly. The family immigrant therefore settles down with only occasional, sentimental thoughts of home. The society of his fellow immigrants claims his loyalty, and links with the old country are mainly through letters and the arrival of new settlers.

The concentration of immigrants in industrial areas is due mainly to economic pressure but also partly to a positive desire to live in contact with kinship and co-religious groups. Thus, Sikhs are concentrated in Southall and Smethwick, Pakistanis in Bradford. The West Indian immigrants are more widely dispersed, since they are less closely bound together by the feeling of being a minority. As English-speaking Christians most West Indians would be prepared to live anywhere in Britain where work was available. Lack of technical skill and the difficulty of finding housing accommodation in all white districts are, however, factors encouraging a degree of concentration in the growing immigrant areas of the industrial towns and cities.

Whenever immigrants arrive in a new country they find that the cultural norms of the host community are different from their own. No matter how much they may wish to conform there will be a transition period because the new arrivals bring with them their own culture as part of their personalities.

The West Indian culture is not entirely British but if the willingness to conform is present, the change should not be very lengthy nor painful. For the Indian or Pakistani the change would be more fundamental. Cultural and religious pressures are likely to make assimilation for them a very slow process indeed.

When immigrants are very few in number the pressure to conform to the host society is extremely strong. A large group of immigrants, however, can form a community of their own if they are linked by culture or religion. Once this is done the likelihood of assimilation is greatly reduced. The most to be hoped for is

IMMIGRATION — A VITAL POLITICAL ISSUE

some form of integration, which Rashmi Desai in *Indian Immigrants in Britain* has defined as 'compatible and relatively peaceful existence . . . within a wider society'. This is a state somewhere between assimilation and complete isolation. The exact position will vary from group to group. West Indians will probably be assimilated culturally and separated only by the barrier of colour. Indians and Pakistanis will remain more isolated by religious and cultural barriers. Individuals from any group may well break away to take up a different position by making personal relationships within other groups.

Unassimilated groups will be those who find satisfaction in their own culture and religion sufficient to reject the attractions of the host society, or those which are rejected by the majority on racial, cultural or religious grounds. Clearly British society with unassimilated groups loosely associated with it is going to be quite different from the previous cohesive and unitary structure.

A recent public meeting in Bradford East was told that parts of Bradford 'can only be described as ghettos' and that 90 per cent of the Council and 98 per cent of the people were 'convinced that the coloured population of this city have no intention of integrating'. There will undoubtedly be friction at some of the points of contact and the general change in our social structure will be regarded with varying degrees of displeasure. It will be difficult to accept that people whose ways are fundamentally different are not contributing to the erosion of traditional qualities and standards of value.

Accusations are made against immigrants that they are contributing to the reduction in moral standards in Britain. It is perhaps unfortunate that mass immigration should have occurred at a time when there is much public disquiet over increasing crime and a decline in responsible behaviour. In the past popular criticism has been directed against the cinema, comic books and television as causes of moral decline; more recently immigrants have been accused without much investigation of the facts and with little reason.

One difficulty which arises is that moral standards vary between

different cultures. Behaviour which is perfectly acceptable to one society, for example polygamy in Pakistan, is alien to another. Absolute standards are hard to define. However there is broad agreement on what is criminal activity and few people would criticise immigrants merely for being different in their social behaviour.

There are bound to be protests, however, if immigrants openly flout the moral standards in the country to which they come. There is an obligation on them not to affront the sensibilities of the host community. The Pakistanis in Birmingham who 'bought' a fifteen-year-old girl and took her home to a house where other immigrant men were waiting cannot really have believed that what they were doing was reasonable in Britain or anywhere else. This kind of incident is bound to arouse ill-feelings. Immigrants themselves have a responsibility in matters of this kind.

British society is bound by unwritten, unspoken rules which vary from district to district and between social classes. These rules present real problems for the new citizen. The immigrant cannot easily or quickly learn 'the British way of life'. To become accepted in many areas requires long years of residence and conformity, qualifications not held by recent immigrants from overseas. The individual foreigner in his national costume may well be regarded with a tolerance tinged with amusement. He will undoubtedly find courtesy and help in this country because he is regarded as a representative of the 'lesser breeds without the law'. To him will be offered a condescending, paternal welcome. The immigrant who is a competitor for housing, education or employment is seen quite differently. Certainly there is no quarter given to the sexual rival.

Immigrants find our social structure closed and forbidding and yet they are criticised for remaining outside it. Failure to conform is resented but attempts to break into the rigid fortresses of society are even more immediately opposed. The zest and spontaneity of the Negro and the withdrawn introspection of the Asiatic are both criticised with equal impartiality.

IMMIGRATION - A VITAL POLITICAL ISSUE

City life is often cold and unfriendly. Immigrants feel this to be directed against them. In fact most people have little objection to the general presence of coloured people in this country. In 1956, 72 per cent claimed that they did not resent immigration. However, extenuating circumstances often arise when the generally expressed goodwill is challenged by personal experience. It is a remarkable fact that many of the most vocal critics of coloured people preface their remarks with 'I have no colour-bar but . . .'

Occasionally, immigrants exploit the mingled superiority and sympathy which characterises so many people's approach to the coloured person. 'I'm just a poor coloured boy, boss,' has won many a job from an employer who prides himself on his lack of discrimination. At the same time, 'They can't help it,' a phrase referring to coloured people's pigmentation, infuriates the proud immigrant.

Most immigrants find that the host community shows little overt aggression. Rather there is an avoidance of contact. Where this is impossible, for instance at work, coloured people may be accepted but they are rarely invited home as guests. The temporary visitor, the student and the trainee are more welcome than the worker seeking a permanent job, but the more settled immigrants resent colour prejudice much more than do those who intend to return home after a short stay.

Mixed marriages, the final stage of acceptance and assimilation, are very strongly opposed. Even people professing liberal views on immigration and race-relations object to miscegenation. The fact that very few immigrants are really interested in finding a British wife is frequently forgotten in this controversy.

The coloured man remains a stranger in Britain even if he stays here a long time and seeks to conform to our code of conduct. He learns to eschew many of the approaches which are made to him by white people. These rarely arise from personal friendliness. All too often they are based on religious duty or social conscience or on political considerations. The coloured person on such occasions feels that he is 'on show' and has been invited

purely to satisfy his host's own needs. He feels patronised and so develops contacts with his own people to avoid such embarrassing incidents.

Perhaps only in the universities is there any real amount of easy contact between the races on the social level. All too often elsewhere the whole range of people other than Europeans are classed as 'coloured folk', a race apart. Lack of knowledge and understanding on both sides leads to little real contact and communication.

THE FAMILY UNIT

For all these reasons immigrant communities tend to be exclusive. In their family and social life immigrants try to re-create the familiar pattern of the homeland.

A West Indian family is conditioned by its insecurity. The parents are often not formally married and the casual liaison is commonplace. The children are usually much loved and affection is lavished on them but insecure parents, in particular 'fathers' who may or may not be the parents of all the children, will often seek to assert their authority and enforce strict discipline. A forced outward conformity to the rules frequently leads to rebellion from the children as they grow older.

Juvenile delinquency rates are much higher in the West Indies than in this country. Early sexual experience is not regarded as moral delinquency and this problem is causing anxiety to welfare workers in this country as the West Indian population grows. Outwardly, however, West Indian children are well behaved and have good reputations for conduct in schools. A question remaining to be answered is whether they will conform to West Indian or British behaviour norms when they leave school in significant numbers.

West Indian social activities centre round community 'parties' and religious observance. The parties are usually noisy but good-natured. Neighbours complain about the noise and the police about the illegal sale of liquor. A police raid on such a party in Smethwick found 250 West Indians crammed into a tiny

IMMIGRATION - A VITAL POLITICAL ISSUE

terraced house. It was so crowded that the police could not get in to turn them out!

Some West Indians join British church congregations but most prefer to meet for worship in their own way. They like a revivalist kind of service such as is provided by some of the smaller sects. A proposal by a Midlands vicar that separate church services should be provided to cater for West Indian tastes has found little support from either white or coloured church-goers.

A few West Indians have been attracted to Gospel Halls of various kinds in this country but most choose to gather in assemblies for worship in the Caribbean pattern. They place religious observance high on their list of priorities and frequently are shocked by the lack of church-going in this country by British people.

Indians try to re-create the conditions of home within their houses. Gatherings are usually of kinship groups from one or more villages. They try to buy from their own group members and to generally support one another economically. There is strict regard for social position and the leaders wield great influence. The leader usually makes few concessions to the society in which the group lives so a separate spokesman may be chosen for communication with the surrounding community.

Strict religious observance also brings much respect. The divisions of caste are of great importance but may be relaxed outside the home. The high-caste Hindu may work alongside a Moslem and even eat his food near him but to invite him home would be quite unthinkable. Marriage outside the caste might be tolerated in this country but on return to India expulsion would be automatic. This is a pressure against inter-racial marriage but leads to the less serious offence against caste of liaisons or prostitution.

No member of the kinship group could be turned away from the house and even unknown members of the same caste must be offered a welcome. This causes overcrowding as the house becomes a kind of reception centre. As families arrive the single men are crowded into the remaining bedrooms. To turn anyone

out is not to be considered, so the only solution is for all to contribute to the purchase of another house. Contributions are made without documents. Such is the strength of the caste-group. The Indian women keep their traditional clothes but many men dress in European fashion to obtain jobs. Only the old men and new arrivals cling to traditional modes of dress. The children usually have two separate outfits, one European for school and one traditional for special occasions at home. The boys adapt quickly to Western clothing but the girls are more conservative. It takes many weeks in school before they will remove outer clothing for physical education. The girls who arrive here in their early teens are the biggest problem. They are regarded at home, and see themselves, as of marriageable age and they do not wish to become schoolgirls. Many make few school attendances. The younger Indian children who have time in school to adapt themselves to the different routine are usually quick, alert, attentive and well behaved.

Sikhs are a minority group even in their Punjab homeland. They are used to being a minority long before they arrive in England. This helps them to accept the situation they find. They quickly set up a Sikh community structure and are well organised. The Temple is the social and political centre as well as the religious focal point. The Temple Committee is a semi-democratic group concerned with all aspects of life and conduct. Offenders may be called upon to justify themselves before the whole congregation. A Smethwick Sikh, who accused the Temple Committee of being the tools of the Left-wing Indian Workers' Association, was shouted down and pelted with pennies when he attempted to justify his case at the Temple.

More and more of the Indian immigrant workers are being joined by their wives and families. This is a trend to be encouraged within the limits of total numbers of immigrants allowed. Houses occupied by immigrant male workers are usually the worst kept. The arrival of wives leads to marked improvement.

Pakistanis are the least integrated of our immigrants. They are

IMMIGRATION - A VITAL POLITICAL ISSUE

divided from the host community by culture, language and religion. Few Pakistani men intend to be permanent residents in this country so they rarely seek to bring over their dependants. All too often Pakistanis live in lodging houses which are barrack-like in their lack of privacy. Since the aim is to save as much as possible from the weekly wage to take home, poor facilities are accepted and a low standard of living ensues. An inadequate diet, coupled with long hours of work and an inclement climate, combine to create a high sickness rate among Pakistanis in this country.

In one sense the Pakistanis are ideal immigrants. They are nearly all workers. They make few demands on the social services. They are prepared to accept difficult or unpleasant jobs. They are mild-mannered and inoffensive. On the other hand, they show no interest in integration with British society. Their general health is unsatisfactory and their housing conditions are usually of the poorest.

As so few Pakistani women accompany their menfolk, and as the Moslem view of woman's status is one in which the woman exists for the convenience of the man, Pakistani communities are frequently the source of severe social problems. Prostitution is not acceptable to Moslem law but casual liaisons, as it were temporary concubinages, are common. This leads to difficulties. As a Midlands social worker pointed out at a recent conference, it is not uncommon for a white woman to live with a Pakistani for some years and bear his children, only to be turned out on the arrival of his legal wife or his return home.

White women who do form such relationships with Pakistanis, or who marry one of them, find themselves expected to behave like a Moslem wife. They are confined indoors for much of the time and are at the beck and call of the husband and his friends. Some women, however, find a kind of security in this life and prefer it to going out to work. Frequently, a Pakistani immigrant returning home will pass on his wife to one of his countrymen who is remaining.

Occasionally one white woman will act as wife to a whole

group of Pakistanis. The Medical Officer of Health for Wednesbury, Staffordshire, told a newspaper reporter of two cases of women who behaved in this way. 'They act as housekeepers, cooking and cleaning and so on. And they charged 2s 6d a time for other services.' Such an arrangement is outside the jurisdiction of the local council. Such a house is not a brothel. This sort of degradation leads to racial ill-feeling and is the responsibility of both the immigrants and the women concerned. It should be stopped at once.

Pakistanis cling to the customs of home and if they are able to do so are likely to transfer Moslem life to Britain intact. Whereas richer Indians often affect an English outlook richer Pakistanis are more likely to be able to indulge the wish to remain Moslem. A poor Pakistani living in a lodging house may only be able to dream of a full life back home but his landlord may well be able to afford to follow traditional customs even to the ritual slaughtering of a sheep at the birth of a son.

Some immigrants seek greater acceptance by the host community. Desai in *Indian Immigrants in Britain* records the case of the Indian who claimed to be a refugee from Kashmir. He knew that refugees are welcomed sympathetically in this country and sought to identify himself with them. English people are more welcoming to students than to immigrant workers. Immigrant students were noted by the Institute of Race Relations in *Coloured Immigrants in Britain* by the common wearing of college scarves and blazers to identify themselves to the public at large. The wearing of European clothes does not, however, greatly ease the position, since the wearer is expected to conform far more closely to English norms than his more exotically dressed compatriot. The amassing of goods of a nature coveted by the members of general society can lead to an immigrant being criticised for doing too well. 'They all have big cars and flashy clothes' is typical of the kind of comment widely heard in areas where immigrants are prosperous.

In fact, while squalor and low standards of living among immigrants are strongly condemned, there is a tendency to regard such

IMMIGRATION - A VITAL POLITICAL ISSUE

conditions as natural, and the immigrant who seeks to improve himself is getting ideas above his station. This view, typical in the United States, is gaining ground here in Britain. Indians and Pakistanis are resented for their strangeness and withdrawal but West Indians arouse hostility because of their extroversion and love of ostentation. One of the reasons for the relatively peaceful relations between immigrants and natives in Bradford has been the quiet effacement of the Pakistani community.

Immigrants find little welcome in British social life. They feel unwanted in the pubs and the clubs are often closed to them. This leads to the setting up of all-coloured clubs which further emphasises the separation of the races. At Smethwick Indians have their own cinema and social activity at the Sikh Temple. Recently plans have been made for a night club for Indians, to offer games, films and other activities. Local residents strongly opposed the proposal because of their fear of nuisance and noise, despite assurances that the club would be closed by 10.30 pm and that no alcohol would be sold.

There is little evidence to indicate that immigrants are less law-abiding than the host community. Where there is cause for complaint it is often due to cultural differences. We may regard as a crime something quite natural to many immigrants. For example, Indian hemp is not regarded as a dangerous drug in the West Indies but its use in this country often gets Caribbean immigrants into trouble. The carrying of knives is common among many Asiatics and Arabs. Quarrels which would be settled by blows among English people may thus lead to stabbings. Sexual promiscuity is regarded lightly by West Indians and this can lead to trouble in this country.

CRIME

Newspaper publicity tends to exaggerate the number of offences committed by coloured people. The race of the offender is reported even when it is completely irrelevant to the case. Migrant, rootless communities have always produced a higher percentage of criminal offences than more settled people. The Negro crime

A QUESTION OF COLOUR?

rate is higher in America's northern cities than in the South, and Irish offenders make up a disproportionate number of persons charged with crimes in such large cities as Birmingham. Table IV gives the total numbers of Commonwealth citizens sentenced to imprisonment in the years 1962 and 1963.

TABLE IV CONVICTIONS OF COMMONWEALTH CITIZENS

1962-3

Origin	1962			1963		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Africa	208	7	215	232	8	240
Australia	22	3	25	32	—	32
Canada	83	6	89	88	10	98
Cyprus	147	1	148	140	3	143
India	165	13	178	208	4	212
Malta	109	3	112	108	4	112
New Zealand	12	1	13	17	—	17
Pakistan	49	—	49	73	—	73
West Indies	701	19	720	753	26	779
Other	146	10	156	131	6	137
Total	1,642	63	1,705	1,782	61	1,843

The figures in Table IV do not include convictions of citizens of the Republic of Ireland.

The totals, though considerable, especially in the case of West Indian offenders, can hardly be regarded as overwhelming. Certainly immigrants are no more prone to serious crime than our own people, but this should not prevent us from seeking to reduce the incidence of certain crimes among them.

In July 1963 it was stated by the Home Secretary that of the 607 persons convicted of being in possession of dangerous drugs in the previous twelve months, no less than 372 were Commonwealth immigrants. In Birmingham in 1963 and 1964 of all the cases of drug-trafficking among immigrants about 75 per cent of those charged were West Indians. The penalty for drug-peddling

IMMIGRATION — A VITAL POLITICAL ISSUE

should be automatic deportation, but, unfortunately, only eleven of those convicted were in fact sent home. There can be no excuse for this. Here is a growing danger among our young people and its seriousness should be brought home to those who at present regard the use of marijuana quite lightly.

The affront to British moral standards in the mushrooming of brothels in the twilight areas of our immigrant-affected cities should be curtailed. From Slough and Balsall Heath, Birmingham, come reports of open disregard for the law in this respect. In 1958 of the 127 convictions for living on immoral earnings within the Metropolitan Police District forty were of coloured men. During 1962-3 the number of convictions rose to 182 of which 101 were immigrants — a higher proportion of the higher total. Nine offenders were deported. In Birmingham all the cases of brothel-keeping by immigrants led to charges against Pakistanis. Living on immoral earnings led to the prosecution of eight West Indians and four Pakistanis while four West Indian women were charged with soliciting.

These offences should also lead to automatic deportation. The peaceful, law-abiding immigrant would have nothing to fear from such measures; in fact he would gain from the improved image of the overseas community after the troublemakers were packed off home.

There should be a propaganda campaign against the carrying of knives. It is an offence for anyone to carry a weapon, but hidden knives are often unseen until there is a heated argument. The sort of report received by the Smethwick Borough Council in 1964 that there had not been 'an abnormal number of knife fights' in an immigrant area is hardly likely to engender confidence. Deportation should certainly follow conviction for unlawful wounding.

In the Metropolitan Police District in 1960 the proportion of crimes of violence committed by Commonwealth immigrants was 13 per cent compared with 6 per cent in 1950. Over 30 per cent of attacks on the police in 1960 were by immigrants. A report by the Institute of Criminology gave a full analysis of crimes of

violence in England and Wales over a ten-year period. It stated: 'It is quite clear that the proportion of immigrants who are convicted of crimes of violence is far greater than that found in the indigenous population. They committed 33 per cent of the attacks on the police and just over 20 per cent of the public fights. The figure for sexual attacks was 7 per cent.'

Then again, in June 1962 the Chief Constable of Birmingham, Mr E J Dodd, stated that immigrants form a high proportion of the criminals caught. He added: 'Immigrants to the city all too often used weapons of violence.'

A West London magistrate said in June 1965 that there was 'far too much violence, particularly, I regret to say, amongst our coloured visitors'.

At present, immigrants who have resided in this country for more than five years cannot be deported. This is ridiculous. It means that the petty criminal may on rare occasions be sent home but that the hardened offender is safe from this punishment. Surely immigrants should remain in this country only on good behaviour. The law should be amended to allow for automatic deportation at the end of any prison sentence. At present only about half of the recommendations for deportation are approved. This is quite wrong. A court's recommendation should be final. Equally there should be co-operation between Commonwealth police forces to ensure that known criminals do not enter this country. If they can be kept out and those who commit crimes here are deported then the image of the remaining immigrants will be greatly improved.

During the debate in 1963 on my proposals for repatriation and the exclusion of criminals and the chronic sick I received a significant letter from North London. It was written by a Jamaican who worked in the boiler room of a large hospital. He expressed full agreement with what I had said and added: 'If you send the layabouts home, those of us who are here to work will get on better.' I believe he expressed the views of many hard-working immigrants.

I have found that many immigrants do give support to my

IMMIGRATION — A VITAL POLITICAL ISSUE

policies. They realise that the vast numbers create the alarm so they favour control. Seeing at first hand the 'fiddles' worked by some of their compatriots they realise that long term ill-feeling is being caused.

A letter in the *Birmingham Evening Mail* of April 1964 highlighted one of the issues that cause bitterness. It said: 'I am in charge of the wages office of a large firm, and I am pretty conversant with PAYE. At my firm, out of a total of 100 coloured employees, only two pay any tax, and those two are obviously too young to have a dependent family.

'Of the remainder, no fewer than seventeen have the highest code number possible—code number 225.

'A Pakistani needs only to obtain an affidavit stating that he has a number of children, support his claim with a few money order counterfoils, and he gets an allowance in his coding for all his children as claimed. He may or may not have a family in accordance with his affidavit, but where the system falls down is that the immigrant can obtain child allowance of hundreds of pounds even though he may send only £10 home.

'Where Jamaicans and other West Indians are concerned a birth certificate is needed, but as illegitimacy is the way of life of those islands, it is quite easy for immigrants to borrow birth certificates to obtain allowances.'

There was much controversy over the accuracy of the statement but this is certainly a field for close investigation and a tightening up of the regulations. In seeking the truth I received a letter from an Indian in Manchester. He confirmed the state of affairs, writing: 'Almost all the immigrants here have put in false returns showing that they are maintaining their wives and children in their countries, although they are not even married. That they are maintaining their invalid or disabled parents who may be quite healthy and they have been given vast concessions in income tax. And the more interesting thing is that the immigrants who have been given concessions on false returns, only send the money home like that only a few times to give the proof once and then they stop sending it. And they go on getting tax concessions.'

This kind of thing could be ended once and for all if there was a single standard for the granting of allowances. All too often the difficulties of obtaining proof are accepted. The onus should be on the applicant to prove his case. The fear of colour-bar accusations has led officials of both national and local government to lean over backwards to be accommodating to immigrants.

Lord Elton in his book *The Unarmed Invasion* quotes the case of an Asian bus conductor who had earned in one week, through heavy overtime, a gross wage of £32 5s 7d. He owned three houses used as boarding houses. He is a single man. He pays no income tax!

There are so many complaints about apparently favourable treatment that there should be an immediate investigation and the regulations should be revised to close the loopholes. I have myself watched West Indians in large cars arriving at the Office of the Ministry of Labour in Handsworth, Birmingham, to draw their weekly allowances of unemployment pay. I must admit that it is a galling sight to hard-working people, which I might well have discounted had I not seen it for myself. Unemployment pay should be dependent on willingness to work. A Ministry of Labour official told me how the requirement is avoided. An Indian with good English will apply at the Employment Exchange for unemployment pay. He has to be offered a suitable appointment so he is sent for a semi-clerical post. On arrival at the office he lapses into pidgin English and is of course not accepted. He returns to the Exchange to collect his unemployment pay. He cannot be directed to a labouring job since he shows evidence of higher education and yet he can avoid clerical employment for as long as he likes. If unemployment pay is refused then his wife and family accompany him to the Office of the National Assistance Board. This sort of thing is reported from all over the country.

There are also complaints about the administration of National Assistance. A constituent of mine related with some justifiable emotion her own experience. She is a widow and approached the National Assistance Board for help with her daughter's school

IMMIGRATION - A VITAL POLITICAL ISSUE

uniform. She was refused assistance. This she might have accepted with good grace except that next to her were two Jamaican girls who claimed that their common law husbands had left them. They were both assured that their rent and light and heat would be paid for them!

This abuse of the welfare state is not likely to improve race-relations. Some months before the 1964 General Election a reporter and photographer from a well-known Sunday newspaper asked me to introduce them to a Smethwick coloured family. I took them to the now famous, but then unknown, Marshall Street. A West Indian whom I had met during canvassing agreed to be interviewed. He showed us his own family's single room with its paraffin heater and told us that he owned the whole house and the one next door. We all saw the notebook in which he recorded his rents. The newspaper photograph showed him totting up his accounts. Some weeks later the same West Indian was before the courts charged with criminally assaulting a young girl. In evidence it was stated that he and his family lived on National Assistance! Surely there should be a closer check on applicants from overseas. We should then see an end to the kind of case reported by *The Times* in 1965 of an immigrant who, charged with public indecency, was said by the police to have done no work since his arrival in England eight years before, and to be drawing £3 10s 0d in pension and National Assistance.

It is a sad commentary on the situation that when Sir David Renton, MP, recently asked the Minister of Pensions and National Insurance how many Commonwealth immigrants and aliens respectively, including their dependants, had been receiving National Assistance for more than six weeks, he was told: 'I regret that the information asked for is not available.' It should be made available, and soon.

No-one would suggest that these parasites are more than a tiny minority or that the provisions of the welfare state are not abused by some of our own people. The need is for a closer investigation and a willingness to ignore the implied threat to invoke a colour-bar protest.

A QUESTION OF COLOUR?

Abuses will continue until there is closer control, because the National Insurance and National Assistance payments which are regarded as low by people in this country are seen as generous by those from poorer areas of the world. A family can live better on National Assistance in Britain, without having to work, than they could in Jamaica with its low wage levels and under-employment.

In a written answer to a recent parliamentary question it was said of immigrant applicants for National Insurance and National Assistance benefits: 'They can qualify for National Insurance benefits under the usual rules. They may receive family allowances when they have lived here long enough to satisfy the residence conditions which are appropriate in their case, having regard to their nationality, place of birth, previous residence, etc. If they are not employed and are in need, they may claim National Assistance which is payable without any condition as to nationality or length of residence.'

Some immigrants capitalise on the language difficulty to hide the fact that they are in business. My Ministry of Labour friend told me of the two Indian brothers who came to collect unemployment pay. The younger, finding that he received less than his elder brother, threw his money at the clerk with the words: 'Keep it! I don't need it anyway.' The two then left the offices and climbed into their van stocked with drapery and fancy goods. Such men buy their stock for cash and sell in immigrant houses. There are no accounts. They pay no income tax. Yet they are eligible for unemployment pay! The landlord received National Assistance but my widow constituent could not obtain help with her daughter's school uniform. Is it any wonder that there is bitterness?

Large numbers of people can only live peaceably side by side if they conform to the rules. Those who cheat create ill-feeling. If they are coloured then the resultant anger is racial tension. Stop the abuses by the minority and the others can live in harmony.

EMPLOYMENT

The field of employment is one of the vital sectors in the relations between immigrants and the home community. Basically, immigrants come to Britain in search of jobs which will give them an income far in excess of that obtainable at home. Even the lowest paid jobs in Britain offer better rewards than anything available to the unskilled worker or even the artisan in Asia or the Caribbean.

A complaint against the immigrant community is that some of those newly arrived do not take up employment at all. Clearly, for some immigrants, the provisions of the welfare state are sufficiently generous to provide a standard of living which removes the incentive to work. However, most immigrants are genuinely interested in improving their economic conditions as much as possible. They have shown considerable initiative in getting here in the first place so it is unlikely that they will, in any numbers, fail to seek remunerative employment.

As always, the black sheep make it bad for others and the immigrant who arrives in London clutching a slip of paper inscribed with the address of the local office of the National Assistance Board can be held, mistakenly, to be typical of all. Many immigrants have indeed been helped on arrival in this country, particularly by the provision of warmer clothing more suited to our climate, but most newcomers make their way without assistance to their temporary homes with relatives or friends.

The great demand for unskilled labour which has continued almost unbroken in the post-war world has made it possible for immigrants to find work even if they are without industrial training. They have taken over in the less pleasant or less well-paid unskilled jobs. Many of them accept permanent night work.

The bus and rail transport services have come to rely on a large proportion of immigrant workers. London Transport, which has run its own recruiting drives in the West Indies, has

two-fifths of its staff made up of coloured workers. In Birmingham the Corporation Transport Department employs one-fifth immigrants.

Many immigrants have taken on work as moulders in foundries in the Midlands and others are employed in large numbers in the mills of Lancashire and Yorkshire. Few immigrants have taken on the really heavy jobs in industry, partly because their physique and temperament have proved unsuitable and partly because of resistance by powerful trade unions. For example, proposals to use immigrant labour in the coal mines have been consistently opposed whether the newcomers are European or coloured. A recent call by Mr Leo Abse, MP, for the employment of immigrants in the Monmouthshire coalfield was met with a blank refusal.

Dockers in London threatened strike action if immigrants were employed. In effect, resistance has been greatest in the traditional heavy industries and in those which have known chronic unemployment in the past. It has been least in the less organised trades, in those which have little prospect of recession, or in such industries as building, which have always been irregular in their employment prospects and casual in engagement practices. A considerable number of Indians work as carpenters on building sites, where their craftsmanship is highly regarded.

At the end of 1963 there were more than 10,000 pupil nurses from the Commonwealth in the hospitals of England and Wales. A large number of other coloured persons were employed as domestic workers. The hospital services have come to rely to a very considerable degree on the supply of immigrants. It has been noted however that few immigrant nurses are employed in the important teaching hospitals.

The fear has also been expressed by the matron of one major hospital that the traditional enthusiasm of British girls for nursing may be discouraged if it becomes a 'coloured' occupation. This would be a great pity and every effort should be made to recruit a balanced force. It is important that vacancies are found for British applicants even if this means that immigrant

IMMIGRATION – A VITAL POLITICAL ISSUE

trainees have to be more widely spread over a larger number of hospitals.

Immigrants have not found their way into agriculture in any numbers and they are relatively few in the retail and distributive trades except in firms owned and operated by Indians. We have already noted the considerable growth in the numbers of Continental grocers in the last ten years. These shops largely serve the immigrant community and are often concerned with the provision of supplies to one narrow religious or racial group. The growth in the number of Chinese and Indian restaurants in recent years has been very rapid. Catering firms have made wide use of immigrant domestic workers while many Cypriots and Italians work as waiters. Two large London caterers recently announced that they intended to recruit and train workers in Trinidad for employment in their restaurants.

While the demand for labour persists there is little discrimination in employment by firms which have once 'taken the plunge'. Some concerns, however, either refuse to employ coloured people at all or operate a very limited quota system.

Immigrant pupils on leaving school find little difficulty in obtaining suitable employment. Youth Employment Officers find little prejudice in placing youngsters who speak good English and who have had a British education. Whether this will continue as the proportion of immigrant school leavers rises – in Birmingham to 17 per cent by 1978 – only time will tell. For the present, few employers in industry refuse coloured trainees; some restrict the numbers employed. Opportunities in office work and the retail trades are more limited by the employers' fear of the reaction of customers to coloured staff.

There is usually less prejudice in employment against West Indians than against Asiatics. Of course, some employers complain that they have had unfortunate experiences with coloured workers but most who discriminate do so because it is easier to turn away the immigrant applicant than to make provision for him.

From Wolverhampton comes a story of discrimination in

reverse. There have been complaints from that town that coloured conductors on the Corporation buses allowed coloured passengers to travel free of charge. It was also suggested that other immigrant conductors allowed coloured people to travel at reduced rates. The complaints have aroused considerable controversy in the area.

It is in the field of 'special provision' for immigrant workers that misunderstandings so easily arise. Separate facilities can so readily be labelled 'segregation'. This has happened on several occasions in the Midlands.

Some Indians, who are strict in their observance of religious obligations, find European toilet facilities unsuitable. Forbidden by conscience to sit on a lavatory seat or to use toilet paper they attempt to approximate to Asiatic conditions with disastrous and embarrassing results. Employers who have provided special lavatories have been attacked by those who ignorantly imagine that they are battling against some form of discrimination.

Employers who do not make such provision are faced with complaints from their white workpeople about the 'filthy habits' of the Indians. This is an example of public ignorance leading to misunderstanding. Such incidents are seized upon by Left-wing anti-discrimination groups and used to further their own purposes. There is need for public education in these matters which are little understood.

There is a gradual expansion of the fields of employment open to immigrants. BOAC is recruiting Jamaican stewardesses for its Caribbean routes. Off-licences are being granted to immigrant applicants and the first coloured publicans have been appointed.

Much public interest has centred on the suggestions for the employment of coloured persons as police constables. A small number of coloured special constables have been appointed but there has been resistance to the idea of coloured policemen, particularly in the large cities, where the shortage of constables is greatest. The main objection is that a coloured police constable might, under certain conditions, find hostility from the public because of his colour. One can imagine that this could occur

IMMIGRATION — A VITAL POLITICAL ISSUE

when dealing with the crowds after closing time or in any incident involving people of different races.

If coloured constables are appointed it would be best for them to work in country districts in the first instance and only after much experience elsewhere to move to areas where there is racial tension. At present the standard of applicants from the Commonwealth does appear to be high enough for appointment.

In 1963-4 the Metropolitan Police rejected twenty-three applications from overseas people. To my mind a more fruitful field for recruitment at present would be among white, ex-colonial policemen whose periods of service have been terminated by independence. These men have experience of multi-racial conditions and being white would probably be more acceptable in city areas. It will be a pity if coloured men are appointed merely to demonstrate a lack of discrimination. Appointment should be on the basis of suitability only.

The Commissioner of Police has made special arrangements to promote greater understanding by policemen of the problems of immigrant communities. These consist of a series of talks by a member of the staff of the High Commissioner for Jamaica to the teaching staffs of the two Metropolitan Police Training Schools, and the inclusion of this subject in the regular talks on current affairs given at the schools. The attendance at one of the training schools of numbers of overseas students from all parts of the Commonwealth also helps greatly to promote understanding. A chief superintendent has been given special responsibility for liaison between the Metropolitan Police and representatives of coloured immigrants and is active in promoting closer contacts. Similar police appointments have been made in other towns and cities where there is a sizeable immigrant population.

It is difficult to estimate how long the demand for immigrant labour will last. An end to restrictive practices would reduce artificial labour shortages. A redeployment of industry to make fuller use of under-employed workers in depressed areas would also reduce the demand for labour from overseas. Any recession in world trade would of course also affect the demand for labour.

Under conditions of reduced demand the flow of immigrants might well be reduced, though many of those already here would be unable to return home because of lack of money for the fares. A considerable proportion of Commonwealth immigrants arrives here on borrowed money which they pay back from their wages. If they were out of work their indebtedness would prevent them from saving to return to their own countries.

The kind of advertising which goes on in Commonwealth countries describing England as a land of opportunity where it is possible to get rich quickly and offering loans for travel to this country leads to much disillusionment. The introduction of some form of voluntary repatriation for the unemployed or those unable to settle down in Britain would be more humane, and probably cheaper than long periods of Unemployment and National Assistance benefits.

The whole question of advantage or disadvantage to this country of mass immigration needs close examination. The economic gain, if any, must be set against the social cost. Certainly the important part played in our economy over the last decade by immigrant workers should not be minimised. Against this it may be argued that a flow of immigrant workers has kept wages low in the industries affected and reduced the incentives towards modernisation.

The social cost of immigration is the pressure on housing and education and the welfare state services. In 1963 the National Assistance Board in South London alone spent £8,012 on repatriating West Indians suffering from ill-health. We have noted elsewhere the high proportion of immigrants who made demands on the Health Service.

It is reported from Smethwick that 35 per cent of the people attending infant welfare and maternity centres were immigrants though they represent only 10 per cent of the town's population. The cost of immigrants to the ratepayers of Smethwick was set at £16,000 a year by a special report from the Borough Treasurer. The report reveals that immigrants cost Smethwick £9,850 a year in special education services and £10,610 in special health

IMMIGRATION - A VITAL POLITICAL ISSUE

services. On services not specifically for immigrants, the expenditure was £6,000 on health and £1,800 on children in local authority care. Midwifery, child welfare, nurseries and clinics cost £12,045. 'It is probably fair to say that immigrants use these services to at least twice the extent that would be expected from their proportion in the total population.'

Immigrants who live in crowded houses are paying less than their share of local rates, and there is much concern that overseas workers may not be paying a fair share of income tax. The high immigrant birth rate leads to pressure on the schools. Non-English-speaking children take up a disproportionate amount of the teacher's time. Rehousing immigrants from slum areas makes heavy demands on the supply of council-owned houses. The vast problem of inter-racial relations takes much time from voluntary and official welfare workers, probation officers and the police. This then is the debit side of the balance. German experience is that a single male worker from abroad is an advantage to the economy. If he is married and has children then there is a net debit balance as the claims of his family on the social services are greater than the wealth he produces. There is little reason to think that the position is any different in Britain. The Central Statistical Office calculated that in 1962 fathers with three children and an annual income of £745 received an average of £66 a year in benefits from the social services more than the total of rates and taxes which they were paying. Since immigrants make greater demands on the social services than do our own citizens then the debit is likely to be greater for each and every immigrant family. Those who favour mass immigration may possibly be able to make a case but certainly not one of general economic advantage to this country.

A skilled worker from overseas may well make a positive contribution to the economy. An unskilled worker who takes a job in an undermanned industry may also be regarded as a valuable entrant, but the vast army of dependants far outweighs the gain from the work of the men. Some industries with labour shortage, especially agriculture, make no gain from immigration. For West

Indians farm labour smacks too much of slavery while to the Asiatic, European farming is a closed book. Unskilled factory work is preferable and higher paid. Since Britain is the only major industrial country open to coloured immigrants many come here who with a free choice would have gone elsewhere. Arrival has nothing to do with 'love for the old country'. It is purely economic in origin and is aimed at economic gain not social contribution. Immigrant women may make an economic contribution if they take a job, and many West Indian women do this. Light factory work and domestic work in hospitals and restaurants are the popular choices. Few Indian or Pakistani women take up employment. Their place is in the home and their husbands would lose face if their wives had a job.

A new problem emerging is that of the status of the immigrant who is given promotion. A recent dispute in a factory near Blackburn arose from the refusal of white workers to accept orders from a Pakistani acting foreman. In Smethwick a strike occurred when the management of a firm apparently indicated that they found immigrant workers more satisfactory than local people.

Up to now there has been little direct competition. Immigrants have filled the jobs left vacant by British workers, but this will not continue indefinitely. Gradually the unpleasant jobs are eliminated as machines take over. As immigrant school leavers complete their training they will seek posts now held by white people. Direct competition will be the greatest test of tolerance. Such competition at a time of economic recession could lead to an explosion. Have those who favour continued mass immigration considered this?

As immigrants prosper so they turn to the purchase of durable consumer goods. They find very little discrimination against them on the part of salesmen except that occasionally hire-purchase is difficult to obtain due to the would-be purchaser's unsettled record of accommodation. Immigrants are frequently persuaded to enter into hire-purchase agreements which they do not fully understand and cannot really afford. There have been many cases of non-payment, particularly on electrical goods.

IMMIGRATION - A VITAL POLITICAL ISSUE

The possession by immigrants of motor-cars has been one of the criticisms levelled against them. West Indians in particular have tended to choose large, rather flashy models such as Vauxhall Crestas and Ford Zodiacs. These vehicles, decorated with artificial flowers, strikingly coloured cushions, reflectors, white-wall tyres, aerials and mascots, are sometimes resented by white citizens, who complain about immigrants flaunting their possessions. This objection is of course completely irrational but appears to have been noticed by the immigrants, who are in some cases now choosing to buy cars of more sober appearance. The pattern appears to be that first cars are frequently second-hand and flashy but experience brings restraint and a preference for new vehicles.

Indians have often been attracted to estate cars and small vans which can be used in connection with businesses, but most Indian and Pakistani workers are little interested in vehicles, preferring to save their money for house purchase or for return home. West Indians have purchased numerous mini-buses which can be used to transport family and friends to gatherings of a social or religious nature.

The demand from immigrants for their national foods has led to the foundation of many 'continental' food stores. Indian grocers and greengrocers are frequently suppliers to a wide immigrant community. English shopkeepers have found that when such shops are open they have few immigrant customers. Some however make a point of supplying immigrants and of obtaining their requirements. Supermarkets, which present no language problem, are popular with immigrants.

Indians in particular have taken an increasing part in the drapery trade. They fit naturally into the markets and supplement this by door-to-door sales among their compatriots. In areas where there are many immigrants several mobile shops may well gather to set up quite an oriental market on Sunday when their customers are at home.

As immigrants become a significant part of the population so their demand for goods becomes more effective. The range of

goods in stores and shops has been greatly widened since immigrants began to arrive. This has meant a wider choice for all consumers and is to be welcomed.

HOUSING

The housing shortage remains the major social problem in our industrial regions. Post-war building has not kept pace with increasing demand. The rising standard of living and the need to clear slums and sub-standard dwellings has meant that housing lists have been hardly reduced at all and many hundreds of thousands are still without satisfactory homes of their own.

At least 125,000 houses a year are needed to meet population growth and net immigration. The recent building figures of some 300,000 houses each year are only sufficient to keep pace with the increasing need and are inadequate to cope with the enormous backlog.

This record means that many families, particularly in the older areas of our great cities, are living in cramped, inadequate homes. Most have no bathroom, many have no indoor toilet and a large number still have to fetch water from outside. Others wait for a home by sharing with in-laws or in expensive furnished rooms. Such people, who may wait up to ten years for a municipal house, are bound to resent the presence of large numbers of immigrants. Cramped dwellings with inadequate sanitary facilities are only painfully kept respectable. One careless family can make life miserable for a dozen others.

People who have perhaps been evicted from one overcrowded dwelling after another are bound to feel bitter when they hear of houses being occupied by several families or used on the shift system. Those who have waited years for a council house are unlikely to look kindly on the allocation of municipal dwellings to coloured immigrants.

Immigrants also find resentment when they purchase houses in hitherto all-white roads. Fears for the depreciation of the price of homes bought at the cost of much sacrifice increases the resentment of householders faced with such a situation.

IMMIGRATION — A VITAL POLITICAL ISSUE

How far can resentment be justified? Is it sheer colour prejudice?

The first coloured immigrants into a district seek lodgings. They have little money and have to accept a very low standard of accommodation. While in university towns coloured students may encounter relatively little prejudice, the immigrant worker finds landladies generally unwilling to accept him. Only with difficulty does he find a room at all. From that moment the desire to own his own house is born.

Immigrants purchasing houses are frequently exploited by those who take advantage of their lack of experience. Particularly in London there has been a 'disreputable fringe' of self-styled estate agents, unscrupulous mortgage brokers and providers of loans on mortgage at high rates of interest. The result of the activities of these people is an immigrant house purchaser who finds himself the owner of indifferent or even downright bad property for which he has paid an inflated price. To meet the debt for repayments and the cost of repairs he is forced to charge high rents and to encourage overcrowding. He may well be faced with early demolition or the end of the lease without having been warned of the consequences.

Unskilled work does not produce very high wages but by dint of careful saving a deposit can be collected to be put on a very inexpensive house. The house-owner is soon inundated with requests for accommodation by kinsmen and compatriots. He is able to charge high rents and to achieve high social status. The house is soon overcrowded and since by its very nature it is inadequate, it becomes a source of complaint by the neighbours.

From Wednesbury in Staffordshire came a description of a house occupied by Pakistanis. It measured scarcely forty feet by twenty. There were five rooms, an attic, a lavatory and a kitchen. Thirty-two Pakistanis lived there. For twenty-five shillings a week they got the use of a bed on the shift system. The cold water and the lavatory were communal. Next door in a similar house lived thirty tenants. Disease and fire hazards are the main risks in such conditions. When a fire broke out in a converted public

house two died out of the sixty-five tenants who had made it their home.

A typical well-documented case comes from Liverpool. A West Indian bought a six-roomed house in decaying Parliament Street for just over £400. The statutory tenants were persuaded to leave. Each of the rooms was then let off to new tenants, in some cases four in a room. The rent was £3 5s a week for each person. The landlord thus had an income of something over 10 per cent return on his capital per week! This income has continued over the years to make the landlord a rich man.

Indians and Pakistanis show the greatest zeal in saving to buy houses. In Birmingham they represent only one-third of the total immigrant population but they own four-fifths of the houses occupied by immigrants. The West Indians generally show less determination. They are much more attracted to motor-cars and hire-purchase furniture. For this reason many West Indians are tenants of Indian or Pakistani landlords.

Houses with full vacant possession are valuable compared with those partly occupied by statutory tenants. Landlords of all races have used improper and even violent means to get rid of sitting tenants. When this is done by a coloured landlord it becomes a race problem. The low rents paid by statutory tenants and a natural desire to offer accommodation to fellow immigrants, coupled with an imperfect knowledge of the law, has led to coloured landlords getting bad reputations.

All kinds of methods have been used to get rid of unwanted tenants. Simple threats and nuisance are sometimes enough. One Jamaican landlord threatened to stab a tenant and later told him that he would run him down with a lorry. Another West Indian used part of his house as a brothel to persuade tenants to leave. He also put livestock into the rooms in the house and sent a tenant a parcel containing a dead mouse.

Parties lasting as long as fifty-six hours have also been used to put pressure on those tenants who are unwilling or unable to leave. Another landlord refused to mend a gas fault for an eighty-year-old tenant. He moved her gas stove to a dark alcove

IMMIGRATION - A VITAL POLITICAL ISSUE

where she could not see properly. In a fall she suffered a broken nose.

A Nigerian landlord used witchcraft to terrorise his unwanted tenants. He hung a shrunken head just inside the front door and burned a mixture of chicken heads and feathers mixed with blood on the stairs.

In Smethwick an elderly tenant complained of similar tactics. His Pakistani neighbours called on him and told him they wanted the house as more Pakistanis were coming. He refused to leave. Every night the dividing fence was banged and pieces were removed. Pakistanis hung about in the dark entry so that the family was afraid to use it. The Englishman was told: 'You go soon.' In the end only a complaint to me brought the intimidation to an end.

No one suggests that only coloured landlords behave like this to tenants or that only coloured neighbours threaten those next door, but when such cases do occur they are made worse by the difficulties of language, understanding of the law and racial prejudice. The rioting in Wolverhampton in August 1965 was a neighbours' quarrel blown up into a racial incident.

The statutory tenants pushed out by threats, nuisance or strong-arm methods are often elderly people, and local resentment grows. The Milner-Holland report dealing with the London area stated that there was no evidence that coloured landlords were responsible for an exceptionally high incidence of abuses. Where they did occur, it was found vacant possession was the goal. Sometimes they had purchased the property without fully realising the legal implications of controlled tenancies and, faced with high mortgage payments, they resorted to illegal means to obtain vacant possession so that higher rents could be charged.

Local authorities have shown little enthusiasm in using their powers to enforce restrictions on overcrowding. The procedure is cumbersome and when it is completed the offending tenants merely move in elsewhere. Areas heavily populated by immigrants are not popular choices for designation as clearance areas because the rehousing of the tenants in municipal property presents problems not easily faced.

Few immigrants have been in this country long enough to reach the top of housing authority lists but a growing number will be entitled to rehousing under clearance schemes. Owner-occupiers and tenants, but not lodgers, must be offered alternative accommodation by the local authority if it takes power to demolish a property. Careful handling of such cases involving coloured people is needed.

A process of very gradual introduction of coloured immigrants into municipal estates is clearly desirable. In 1961 the then Labour-controlled Smethwick Council sparked off a local rent strike and nation-wide publicity by rehousing a Pakistani family in a block of new flats. This sort of ham-fisted approach is definitely harmful. Under Tory control Smethwick has housed several immigrant families in council houses or council-owned properties without incident.

Councillor E Gould, Chairman of the Housing Committee, has stated openly that immigrants will be introduced first of all into houses then maisonettes and only later into flats. This seems a sensible, wise and practical policy. Of course such bodies as the Co-ordinating Committee Against Racial Discrimination and Indian Workers' Association, both of which gain publicity from opposing positive proposals and which have Left-wing political sympathies, have come out in opposition to the scheme but those who wish to see peaceful and equitable solutions will welcome Smethwick's realism.

To reduce the number of immigrant families seeking municipal housing at any one time the Smethwick Council offers a higher amount of compensation to landlords who will forgo the alternative accommodation principle. Since municipal houses may not be used in multi-occupation nor may lodgers be taken in, such proposals find favour with many immigrants.

Overcrowding in immigrant households is far more common than in houses occupied by English people. The Milner-Holland report gave an example from a district in Paddington where 64 per cent of immigrant households were overcrowded as compared with 29 per cent for the whole estate. This overcrowding is

IMMIGRATION — A VITAL POLITICAL ISSUE

partly due to the housing shortage but is increased by the simple fact that a degree of overcrowding unacceptable to British people is regarded as normal by immigrants. In their own warmer countries much time is spent out of doors and the house is used only for sleeping and meals. A communal life exists which in Britain's colder climate must be transferred indoors. What we call overcrowding is regarded as hospitality. What we would regard as privacy is seen as secretiveness by the immigrant community.

The provision of blocks of flats for immigrants in which this kind of life would be no nuisance to British neighbours may well appear to be one solution, but since few white families would agree to live in such blocks there is the danger of creating segregated communities. The natural wish of immigrants to seek to live close to their compatriots creates a tendency for areas to become 'coloured quarters'. Whether a local council would be justified in creating such units by deliberate policy is difficult to decide. Certainly first-generation coloured immigrants are happier near their friends and if they have to be rehoused then rehousing as a group has much to commend it.

The history of immigration into this country in the past has shown that after immigrants have been here for some years the more successful leave the poorer reception areas and become absorbed into the general community. Second-generation immigrants in particular tend to break with the old society and identify themselves with the host community. Colour will undoubtedly make this more difficult. A second-generation Jamaican immigrant cannot 'disappear' into the community.

India and Pakistan remain the real homes of immigrants from that part of the world and there is not likely to be any great desire to be absorbed into British society. Thus the problem of immigrant communities is likely to remain with us for a very long time.

Where immigrant families are exploited by poor accommodation at high rents the landlord is most often a coloured man himself. The accommodation is offered to people who have little

choice but to pay the high rent charged and the standards regarding space and facilities are based on those far below the norms of British society.

In Birmingham a particularly high proportion of complaints have been against coloured landlords. Bradford has similar complaints. One answer given there is that since few immigrants can find lodgings in white houses the whole community has to find homes in the immigrant houses. In Bradford there are 13,000 Pakistanis but only 300 houses are owned by the community.

The Slough Council of Social Service in an excellent review *Colour and Community* described the process of financing houses in multi-occupation. 'In virtually every case of multiple home ownership by coloured immigrants known to us, there has been a standard pattern of action. The purchaser of one house lets rooms, receives perhaps £400 to £700 per annum income above mortgage costs, and soon buys another house. One room might be occupied by the owner, and four rooms let to a total of eight persons who pay £2 each per week. This would result in a gross income of £832 per annum, with probable mortgage and rates outlay of about £260, giving a net income of approximately £572.

'One semi-detached house, having two reception rooms and two bedrooms all of approximately equal size, one smaller bedroom, a kitchen, bathroom and one separate WC, is let by the owner, who occupies the small bedroom. One room contains three beds used by a total of six immigrants, who pay twenty-five shillings per week each. These six are shift workers, as are another four who use two beds in one of the other rooms, paying thirty shillings per week each. The remaining two rooms contain two beds each, but these are let to only two immigrants per room, at fifty shillings per bed. We then find fourteen tenants paying a total of £23 10s per week, or a gross income of £1,222 per annum. Deduct approximately £275 to cover mortgage and rates, and maybe £50 spent on repairs, the net income from the one house is then £897 per annum.'

Dr Millar, Medical Officer of Health for Birmingham, reported

IMMIGRATION - A VITAL POLITICAL ISSUE

that Pakistani and Indian landlords were the principal offenders among those in the city who failed to measure up to their responsibilities in multi-occupied houses. Of 1,561 houses inspected over twelve months 950, or 61 per cent, were owned or managed by Pakistanis or Indians. Of these 83 per cent were overcrowded, 75 per cent lacked sufficient facilities and 60 per cent were dirty and ill-managed. 'This ill-management contrasts sharply with the remaining 661 houses in other ownerships of which only 9 per cent were overcrowded, 8 per cent lacked facilities and 5 per cent were dirty. . . . It is obvious that many Pakistanis and Indians are setting up in business as landlords and are exploiting the housing shortage. . . . In general their standard of management was below that required by legislation in this country and there is little regard for standards of overcrowding or amenity. . . . It is sad to report that 98 per cent of all legal proceedings taken for contravention of legislation governing houses in multiple-occupation have had to be taken against Pakistanis and Indians.'

Immigrants claim that there is prejudice against them when they seek to buy houses. To meet this some have resorted to purchasing property through a white intermediary. It was this method which led to a coloured family moving in to an all-white area of the Black Country. The residents, who had an agreement not to sell to coloured purchasers, were shocked to find one of their houses sold to a West Indian family. Their first reaction was to offer to repurchase the house but after nation-wide publicity an agreement was reached whereby the coloured family remained in possession.

Few people would resent the arrival of one coloured family into a district but experience has shown that one arrival is quickly followed by others. When the first coloured family moves in, other residents, fearful of the deterioration of the area, put up their houses for sale. White purchasers are reluctant to buy so more sales are made to coloured buyers. The whole process can gain momentum so that in a period of less than five years an all-white street can become an immigrant district with a majority of the houses owned by coloured people.

A QUESTION OF COLOUR?

Some estate agents have sought to avoid antagonising local residents in the sale of houses to immigrants. They have tried to divert coloured purchasers into areas where there is already an immigrant community and to keep them away from all-white districts. Other agents specialise in the sale of property to immigrants. In Smethwick one agency advertises weekly that its facilities are at the disposal of immigrant house-buyers.

Mortgages are usually for a relatively small proportion of the cost of the house. This is because properties sold to immigrants are often elderly or scheduled for early demolition. In any case, immigrants often offer a large part or all of the cost price in cash. Bundles of pound notes wrapped in newspaper have been thrust into the hands of many a startled agent or vendor.

Recently there has been a growth of estate agencies run by and on behalf of immigrants. Sometimes in the Midlands these are closely linked with travel agencies. Such organisations help to finance the journey to this country and the purchase of a house out of income. The burden of such a double debt leads to a low standard of living and a need to press for the highest possible rents from tenants.

There are obvious objections to the formation of 'ghettoes' and 'Little Harlems'. Dr Martin Luther King, the American Negro leader, on a visit to this country spoke to Members of Parliament. He said that the creation of 'little Harlems'—he had visited Brixton—was the most unsatisfactory feature of immigration into Britain.

Dispersal of immigrants would ease the basic problems of housing and education but there are factors working against it. First, there is the resistance of all-white areas to the arrival of immigrants, and secondly, in many ways more important, is the apparent wish of immigrants to form communities of their own race and religion. Sikhs in Southall and Smethwick and Pakistanis in Bradford are developing community lives. Their contacts with the host community are limited to economic activity. Socially there is little meeting and practically no desire for integration. White residents of immigrant areas are very vocal in their calls

IMMIGRATION - A VITAL POLITICAL ISSUE

for dispersal. They fear becoming a minority in their own district and are alarmed at the fall in property values. Residents' Associations have tried to limit the inflow of immigrants but have had little success. At Smethwick a proposal gained official support but floundered on the opposition of the Labour Government. In the absence of dispersal measures, permanent 'ghettoes' will be created.

No proposal for dealing with local immigration housing problems has been so highly publicised or so little understood as the so-called Marshall Street plan. Standing in one of the better residential areas of Smethwick, Marshall Street's large houses have attracted many immigrants both Asian and West Indian. As the number of houses occupied by immigrants approached the 40 per cent mark it became more and more difficult to sell the houses to any but coloured purchasers.

By the beginning of 1965 the white residents began to feel that they would soon be outnumbered and a minority in their own area. A group of residents, led by housewives Mrs A Groves and Mrs C Pereversev, took up the proposals I had made some two years earlier, that the Council might purchase houses in such areas to provide homes for those on the housing list.

They approached the Tory Chairmen of the Housing Management Committee and the General Purposes Committee of the Council. There was general agreement that if vendors would sell to the Council then needy applicants could be housed and any danger of the street becoming some sort of 'ghetto' would be avoided.

Two houses were offered to the Council and, despite Labour opposition, the plan was agreed locally. The Smethwick Labour Party rejected the scheme as being discriminatory and Press reports were unhelpful as they stressed the fact that the houses would be let to white families.

Meanwhile in February a meeting of residents of the street was called to meet me. Dr Dhani Prem, the Birmingham Indian leader, was invited to help the local Indians to express their viewpoints and Luther Thomas, of the West Indian Unity Association, was called in to help the West Indian residents.

A QUESTION OF COLOUR?

The meeting was called to discuss the house-purchasing proposals and to try to get multi-racial agreement on the formation of a 'trouble-shooting' committee which would work to iron out day-to-day problems in the street.

The meeting began badly when officers of the Indian Workers' Association arrived outside to prevent Indian residents from entering the meeting unless they too were admitted. After this sour political note had been injected it is not surprising that the meeting had moments of acrimony.

Dr Prem claimed that the immigrant communities had no responsibility for the general supervision of new arrivals. This was the responsibility of the local councils. There were also differences between local Ward Councillor Don Finney and the Indian Workers' Association leaders over the alleged political bias of that body.

Despite this there was a measure of agreement on the need for a local Residents' Association. On the house-purchase plan there were some differences which could not be reconciled. The Indian point of view was that if the Council proceeded with the plan it should also purchase houses in all-white districts for allocation to coloured families. Despite an assurance that coloured applicants for municipal housing were being allocated homes throughout the Borough full agreement was not possible.

The Council decided to press on with the proposals and after an inconclusive preliminary talk with Richard Crossman, Minister of Housing and Local Government, a request for permission to borrow the necessary money was submitted on 4th March 1965.

The Minister's reply was pointed and definite: 'The Minister recognises that it may be a proper object of policy to seek a wider dispersal of coloured immigrants within the community. But the Council propose only to prevent coloured families from buying certain houses and have, so far as the Minister knows, no corresponding proposals for helping them to find their places in the community. It is thus impossible to regard these proposals as anything but racially discriminatory. The Minister is not prepared to give the sanction asked for.'

IMMIGRATION — A VITAL POLITICAL ISSUE

While the Council considered this reply the Marshall Street housewives met to discuss the situation. They decided to invite Mr Crossman to visit the area to see the local situation for himself. I passed on the invitation from the ladies and was pleased to receive a reply inviting me to accompany them to visit the Minister in Whitehall. After delivering a letter to the Prime Minister at 10 Downing Street, inviting him to reconsider the Marshall Street proposals, the delegation went to the Ministry of Housing and Local Government.

We were received by Mr Crossman, who was accompanied by Mr R Mellish, MP for Bermondsey, his Under-Secretary. It had been agreed that I should take no active part in the discussion, leaving it to the ladies to put their own point of view in their own words. The meeting opened quietly as the proposals were outlined but the atmosphere changed quickly when Mr Crossman made it clear that he had no intention of reconsidering his decision. The proposals were racist and unacceptable. Why could not Smethwick solve its problems like Lambeth or Coventry where immigration had been tackled positively?

As the discussion grew more heated Mr Mellish chimed in with a series of stinging remarks about Smethwick. I noted three of them—'Smethwick's name stinks'; 'Smethwick is highly regarded in Alabama'; and perhaps most significant of all, 'You've voted in Smethwick, you've got your Council and you've got your MP, now get on with it!' Mr Crossman ended the meeting by commenting that if the Council wanted to buy the houses it could purchase them with cash from the rates.

The housewives left the Ministry near to tears. The hopes they had pinned on the personal approach were dashed. A brave and good scheme was doomed. For some weeks there were hopes that funds might be raised for the purchase of the houses. I received two offers of interest-free loans but the scheme foundered on the difficulties of administering such considerable sums of money.

It was hoped at one point that the Council might be able to borrow privately the funds needed for the purchase of the houses. This proved to be impossible without the consent of the Minister.

Dr Martin Luther King's words about 'little Harlems' would be echoed by all who know Southall or Slough, Bradford or Birmingham, Smethwick or Wolverhampton. Blind party prejudice on the part of the Minister of Housing killed the Marshall Street plan. With it were dashed the hopes of many thousands of people in hundreds of back streets in our industrial areas.

When the time comes to apportion the blame for Britain's racial problem Socialist politicians will have much to answer for. They do not have the excuse which many Conservatives can put forward that they did not realise what was happening. Many Labour MPs represent industrial areas greatly affected by immigration. Their blind refusal to face the facts and their political opposition to remedial measures are in large part responsible for the problems which now face us.

There is some disagreement about the course of real-estate prices in areas affected by immigration. Immigrants claim that prices are high while local residents claim that prices are depressed. Probably, both are right. The first immigrant to buy in a district usually has to pay a high price to overcome the vendor's scruples. In America such a purchaser is known as a 'block-buster'. Once he has bought a house white residents panic and put up their homes for sale in considerable numbers. This flooding of the market plus the natural reluctance of white purchasers to buy property in such an area depresses prices considerably.

In America when a group of Negroes decides to move into an area the block-buster may well have to pay 50 per cent above valuation, but if his friends later buy similar houses for 20 per cent below valuation the group as a whole can reap a handsome profit. In Britain the housing shortage in industrial areas makes any real reduction of prices unlikely. In fact, in decaying areas the arrival of numerous immigrant purchasers may well push up house prices.

It is reported from Lambeth in London that under such circumstances prices rose by 20 per cent. Thus white residents in this country are usually able to get a fair price for their houses

IMMIGRATION - A VITAL POLITICAL ISSUE

unless they panic. The real difficulty arises in the cases of elderly people who, even if willing to sell up and move out under the pressure of immigration, are unable to obtain mortgages on new property because of their ages.

Then again retired people who have only pensions on which to live may be unable to accept the expense of a new home if their own old house was fully paid for. The typical result of immigrant penetration of an area is that the younger people move out while the old folk are left behind scattered about in a rapidly forming 'little Harlem'.

The older people want to stay in their homes peacefully for the rest of their days. It is tragic to see these old folk, left behind in abandoned areas, trying to maintain their standards amidst squalor and decay. To leave is to lose their homes. To remain is to accept unhappiness. Why should they be faced with this terrible choice? Firm action to prevent the creation of ghettos is urgently needed.

Relations between the races during the transition period are usually strained and the pressures put by immigrants on old people to sell up and move out are a cause of much ill-feeling. A particularly sad case took place in Smethwick. Immigrants had purchased houses on either side of an elderly widow. Indians frequently asked her to sell her house to them. When she refused they put pressure on her. They continuously behaved noisily near her house. The dividing fence was broken down. Clothes were taken from her clothes-line. Later even the line and pegs disappeared. On one occasion when she left the house for a while, she returned to find Indians sitting in her kitchen. She was afraid to go out and afraid to stay in. A few weeks later she was dead. What a dreadful miserable end for an inoffensive old woman in the England of 1965.

Even when every allowance is made for misunderstandings and language difficulties there is no excuse for such incidents. When Tory Councillor Don Finney reported these facts to Smethwick Borough Council he was accused of race prejudice! Is it any wonder that there is bitterness, frustration and even hopelessness

A QUESTION OF COLOUR?

in the Smethwicks of this country! Only the natural restraint and tolerance of the British people have prevented more incidents like the Notting Hill riots. Just as long as complaints are met with the answer of colour-bar we shall be sitting on a powder-keg.

Luckily in Smethwick at least the Conservative Party has acted as a safety valve. Complaints have been given a fair hearing and many problems solved. Elsewhere, politicians have been scared off by the smear tactics and have preferred to turn a blind eye to what is going on around them.

The complaint that immigrants do not keep their houses clean is widespread. In fact most Indians and West Indians keep their own rooms very clean. It is the communal areas, stairs, entrances, gardens, toilets and back yards which are neglected. No one takes responsibility for them and they get very dirty and untidy.

Helpful neighbours can sometimes work wonders by example and reminder. Immigrants who come from hutted villages in the Punjab or shanty towns in Jamaica rarely understand the need for proper maintenance. Toilets and drains become blocked, paintwork peels or is replaced with unsightly daubings of brilliant hue. Gardens are ignored and hedges overhang the street. In the tropics windows are often without glass or frame and a curtain keeps out the dust and heat. Permanently closed curtains are not appreciated by English neighbours in a British street. Warm climates and cramped living quarters encourage much outdoor activity in sunnier climes. Gatherings on steps or in entrances and out on to the pavements cause complaint in this country.

Clashes between the interests of neighbours are common enough but when they are of differing races and cultures such difficulties are more likely. Indian families see nothing wrong in killing chickens in the back yard. Drains are convenient as urinals. The clash is of culture rather than of colour. This is a field in which the immigrant organisations could play a valuable part. Community leaders who have been in this country for some time will be well aware of the small irritants which lead to bad relations. If they would use their good offices to persuade their

IMMIGRATION — A VITAL POLITICAL ISSUE

compatriots not to affront British standards of behaviour this would be most helpful. The language problem prevents English neighbours from making complaints until such time as the provocation becomes unbearable, then instead of a polite request there is a noisy scene. The lack of understanding of the complaint by the immigrant does not help either.

Smethwick has set a good example with the creation of multi-racial committees at street level. These informal groups can be so much more effective than official bodies. An example springs to mind from much-maligned Marshall Street.

An Indian family lived next door to an English couple. The Indians spoke no English so the only contact was by smiles and nods. One particular habit began to spoil the happy relationship. The Indian housewife was in the habit of pounding her own corn into flour. Each evening, at about seven o'clock, she would start to pound away. The English neighbours worked as insurance agents and were out all day, returning home at six o'clock. Just when they had had their dinner and were sitting down for an evening's peace the thumping from next door would commence. Night after night it went on. Sooner or later there would have been a neighbours' quarrel. Perhaps there would even have been reports of a 'racial incident' in Smethwick. However, a multi-racial residents' meeting had been held in Marshall Street and from this had come an informal committee. The English family's complaint was translated by an Indian member. The Indian housewife now does her pounding at four o'clock and her English neighbours can watch their television in peace. This is just a minor step towards good race-relations but it is the kind of step which is of vital importance.

In any street where immigrants have homes there should be some arrangement for informal meetings. Difficulties can be discussed and sorted out. If this is done then the 'deterioration' in a district, which it is claimed occurs when immigrants move in, could be avoided.

The councils also have a clear responsibility. All too often local authorities appear to close their eyes to what happens in immigrant

areas, particularly if these are slum districts. It is essential that overcrowding and insanitary conditions are prevented from occurring rather than investigated after complaints. The councils' Welfare Officers should help immigrant families during the 'moving-in' stage. Helpful advice can be given and the Officer establishes himself as a friend rather than the agent of a hostile council.

All the local welfare services should be mobilised to tackle the problems which have arisen and the new ones as they occur. There are going to be immigrant households in this country for many years to come so we may as well try to make the best of it.

The answers to the major problems will be found by avoiding concentration into 'ghettoes' and by offering help and advice in a friendly fashion at an early stage. In these ways the natural suspicions of the local residents will be allayed and the best qualities in the immigrants brought out. I have also suggested to the Smethwick Borough Council that firms might provide hostel accommodation for their immigrant workers. Firms who recruit overseas should accept some responsibility for housing their immigrant employees. These are some of the ways in which the housing problems created by mass immigration can be tackled. We shall need vigorous action but most of all tolerance and goodwill.

EDUCATION

The immigrant child presents considerable educational problems. In the first place, he is yet another pupil in an already overcrowded class. Immigrants have settled in the industrial areas where teachers are in short supply and the school buildings frequently inadequate. Even if they presented no other difficulties, the inflow of immigrant children, supplemented by a birth rate several times as great as our own, would increase the pressure on the schools.

It is unfortunate that accurate figures of the numbers of children of Commonwealth citizens and aliens at present in our primary and secondary schools are not available. The size of the

IMMIGRATION — A VITAL POLITICAL ISSUE

problem should surely be known as a first step to tackling it. Certainly the numbers will increase in the next few years as the children born since the immigration rush of 1961-2 enter the schools. It is suggested that the number of immigrant school children is increasing at the rate of 40,000 a year. Accurate statistics should be a priority.

Many children from immigrant families present language problems and all bring with them the difficulties of reconciling completely different cultures. Non-English-speaking children in large numbers create problems with which the average teacher is ill-equipped to cope. Teaching English as a foreign language is a specialist job and most teachers have no experience of it.

Luckily for English schools the problem was faced in both Australia and the United States of America in the early post-war years and experience from those countries has proved invaluable in our schools.

If a non-English-speaking child enters an infants' school at five or six years of age, he joins a community with a limited vocabulary. He finds within the classroom activities opportunities to pick up English naturally and easily. By the age of seven or so the immigrant child can usually speak clear, effective English with a broad local accent. Such a child develops his English as he progresses through the educational system and learns easily to accommodate himself to the cultural and behaviour norms of the school society.

Immigrant children who enter school at a later stage are at a greater relative disadvantage with their English contemporaries if they do not speak their language. Where there is only one non-English-speaking child in a class his progress in the language is usually rapid since he must learn it if he is to communicate at all. If the number of non-English-speaking children grows beyond two or three progress is very much slower, as they form a group and communicate in their own language, which is easier and has the advantage of being unintelligible to others. Wherever such groups exist some form of positive English teaching is essential. The larger the group, the more important it is that the teaching be effective.

The most difficult problem is raised by the thirteen- or fourteen-year-old who enters a school knowing no English. There is little time for teaching him anything before he leaves at fifteen. Often he resents being in school at all and resists efforts to teach him. It is a great pity if he leaves school to join the large number of immigrant workers held to the most menial and unskilled jobs by their lack of knowledge of the English language.

While the number of non-English-speaking pupils remains a mere handful spread throughout a school, little formal organisation is needed for language teaching. If however the numbers exceed two or three in each class then special action is needed.

Two alternative methods of dealing with the problem have been tried out. In the first, non-English-speaking pupils are gathered into a reception class so that they can be given teaching geared to their problems throughout the day. In some areas, notably Huddersfield, this system is extended to a reception school. When the child has learned a reasonable amount of English he is allocated to an ordinary class. The second method, the one most favoured in Smethwick, is to allocate the child to his normal class but to withdraw him for short periods of intensive teaching in English. The two methods can be combined with the second procedure following after the first.

For the teaching of English to be effective it must produce good oral results. This necessitates small groups being taught by direct, conversational methods. Work based on teaching East Europeans in Australia and Puerto Ricans in New York has proved highly effective. However if the teacher is to have groups of only half a dozen or so then this method greatly reduces the number of teachers left for general teaching. One way of dealing with this problem is to make use of unqualified, temporary teachers to carry out the English teaching under the supervision of a highly qualified teacher. The temporary teachers quickly become adept at utilising the interests of the child in his surroundings to encourage spoken English.

In Smethwick the English-teaching programme has reached a high peak of efficiency and we estimate that within two years of a

IMMIGRATION - A VITAL POLITICAL ISSUE

pupil beginning such a course he will be able to take a full part in the classroom with English children. Long before that, of course, the immigrant child can make a valuable contribution to school life in handicrafts, art and games.

West Indian children are usually left out of English-teaching programmes, since English is their native tongue. Recent investigations indicate that this may well account for the alleged slowness of West Indian pupils. They do indeed speak English, but it is not entirely similar in usage or intonation to the English in use in this country. It may well be that short, intensive English language courses would be of great advantage to West Indian children. Probably in the past they have simply not understood the English spoken by their teachers. In Manchester, well over a hundred West Indian children have been found to be in need of special educational help.

The second major problem presented by immigrant children is that of cultural background. West Indian pupils, brought up in schools which are intentionally similar to those in Britain, settle down quickly to the régime of an English school. Indian and Pakistani children find the transition more difficult. Their parents try to maintain in England the family life of Asia. The child finds his home and his school in conflict over aims and values.

Few Indian or Pakistani children stay to school meals. Few of them take part in out-of-school social activities. The clothing of the girls is often found unsuitable for active lessons. These cultural differences create problems, especially in schools which are understaffed. However, on the credit side Asian pupils are usually extremely polite and well behaved, showing respect for learning and an appreciation of the work their teachers are doing.

English parents commonly make complaints if there are numerous immigrant children in the local school. Suggestions that immigrant children are dirty are very rarely justified. Usually they are very clean and well cared for and are normally adequately, though sometimes unsuitably, dressed. There are no great problems found in training them in sanitary habits—the occasional

fall from grace tends to be noticed more readily if the offender is a coloured pupil.

The basic complaint is that non-English-speaking pupils hold back their classmates. This does have some real justification. Unless the teacher is prepared to ignore the special needs of her immigrant pupils she must give much of her time to explaining relatively simple and elementary matters to them. While she does this she cannot be carrying on with the work of the rest of the class. This is particularly worrying to the parents of children facing the eleven-plus examination. The class teacher may proceed with more advanced work while the non-English-speaking pupils are receiving their special teaching, but this is for a relatively short time only. Whether justified or not, parents consider that their child's education is held back if he attends a school which has many immigrant pupils.

It was partly to meet this point that Smethwick abolished its eleven-plus examination. By getting rid of the competitive atmosphere it was possible to reduce the strength of feeling against immigrant pupils. If political opposition had not been mounted, the proposals for dealing with the problems of immigration in the schools might well have all been solved with equal facility.

Unfortunately, the local Labour Party and Indian Workers' Association joined forces to oppose the programme for withdrawing non-English-speaking pupils from their classes for specialist English instruction. Even more unfortunately, certain teachers chose to express views in support of the opposition case and these were highly publicised. The loud protests from the Left were remarkable for their inaccuracy. 'Separate classes' and even 'separate schools' were alleged to be part of Tory policy in Smethwick. When challenged, the lack of substance in these charges was revealed.

In December 1964 *Socialist Commentary* accused me of advocating separate schools. In February 1965 after a firm protest they admitted an 'editorial mistake'! This kind of reckless, unreasoning opposition made the introduction of the necessary programme

IMMIGRATION - A VITAL POLITICAL ISSUE

more difficult than it need have been. Smethwick's record in this field is an extremely good one. There has been no direction of immigrant children from their local schools, and no concentration in special classes or establishments. What a pity then that the false cries of 'segregation' and 'discrimination' were raised in the educational field, purely for party political gain.

Other towns have faced similar problems. Bradford has some 13,000 immigrants. In 1964 there were 1,464 children from the Commonwealth in the schools. Of these 498 did not speak English. In 1965 the number rose to 1,533 of whom 486 are in secondary schools, 610 in junior schools and 437 in infants' classes. The number of non-English-speaking pupils has risen to 550. There were 314 new entrants from the Commonwealth in September 1964 and the tendency is steadily upwards.

Special classes are now provided for a short induction period and a new centre for English-teaching is being developed. One school has over 50 per cent immigrants and several classes show a similar pattern elsewhere. It is aimed to impose a 25 per cent limit as a maximum for each school and to have a 15 per cent non-English-speaking limit in any one class. A particular problem in Bradford is the transitory nature of the Pakistani school population. Something like a hundred new pupils present themselves each month and a similar number are withdrawn. Future estimates of the size of the problem to be faced can only be tentative. Like Smethwick, Bradford is an area which has called for government aid.

The size of the problem elsewhere is equally daunting. Nottingham has some 1,200 immigrant pupils of whom 254 have 'less than adequate' English and 125 are non-English-speaking. In Birmingham, the West Riding and Southall classes have reached 60 per cent coloured. Mr Ben Parkin, MP, has spoken of classes in Paddington with 'only two or three' white children. West Bromwich estimates that by 1968 20 per cent of the secondary modern pupils and 16 per cent of the juniors will be coloured.

In Manchester's schools there are children of no less than twenty-six different nationalities. There are seventeen schools

with a high proportion of immigrant pupils. This is not the full extent of the problem. There are four times as many five-year-old immigrant pupils as there are eleven-year-olds. The problem is thus likely to increase rather than to improve.

For many areas the prospects for the future are truly alarming. The West Riding has some 10,000 Pakistani men working in its towns. What would be the result if they were to send for their families? At present children under sixteen years of age enter the country freely. The stresses on the school system which could develop can be imagined.

The Italian Government has helped to ease the problem in Bedford by seconding Italian teachers to help the immigrant population. Smethwick, which has a large Sikh community, has invited the Indian Government to help by meeting part of the cost of teaching Indian pupils. The Sikh Temple in Smethwick runs a course in Punjabi for Indian pupils and the Temple leaders have called for the teaching of Punjabi and Urdu in the schools.

Batley, Blackburn, Dewsbury, Walsall and Walthamstow all run special classes for non-English-speaking pupils. The London County Council estimated that it needed a further 128 teachers, at a cost of £90,000 a year, to tackle the problem. Several areas transport immigrant children to other schools to keep the proportion below 25 per cent. What will happen when all the schools under a Local Education Committee have over 25 per cent? In the long run, moving the children around is not the answer. The problem can only be solved by the Smethwick type of programme where expert teaching is made available in the local schools.

New teaching methods are being developed. A Sparkbrook, Birmingham, school has developed a new set of reading books for multi-racial classes. Many schools are developing their own techniques for meeting the new problems. One Smethwick school has adapted the Initial Teaching Alphabet to the teaching of immigrant pupils. This further example of the pioneering work going on in Smethwick is proving most successful.

In the field of higher education a difficult problem is caused by overseas students who apply for courses in colleges and when

IMMIGRATION - A VITAL POLITICAL ISSUE

accepted use the acceptance to gain entry into this country but never appear at the college to take up the course. These 'ghost students' cause much administrative difficulty.

There are many immigrant teachers in this country who have come in with priority vouchers. Most of them are Indians or Pakistanis. Those whose qualifications satisfy the Department of Education and Science are recognised as qualified teachers, but few find their way into the schools. It is estimated that some 4,000 Indians and 2,000 Pakistanis having teaching qualifications are employed in other jobs in Britain. Most of these have either not sought teaching posts or have been rejected as unsuitable by Local Education Authorities.

The main reason for rejection or for a reluctance to apply is inadequate command of the English language. Most Asiatics have learned English from teachers whose native tongue is some other language. They may well be able to write reasonably accurate English but their spoken English is poor in intonation and expression. They find difficulty in making conversation in English and regional accents are an added problem.

Teaching in Britain is carried out by quite different methods from those current in India. In many Indian schools there is little equipment and the children are trained to listen docilely to long oral lessons. In Britain, except in the grammar schools, this type of teaching has been replaced with lessons involving much individual activity and research on the part of the pupils. This creates disciplinary problems for which the Indian teacher is unfitted by experience and training to cope. Many Indian teachers who have good academic qualifications have failed in English schools and local authorities show a natural preference for recruiting native English teachers if this is possible.

Some Indian and Pakistani teachers have been successful in the English classrooms but thousands of others remain outside teaching despite the grave teacher shortage. Courses offering instruction in English teaching methods and concentrated practice in spoken English would fit many of these teachers for posts in our schools.

At Question Time in the House of Commons I pressed the Minister of Education to initiate such a course. Mr Crosland's reply that facilities already existed was completely unsatisfactory. The courses at present in operation for the training of intending teachers are three years in length. These are unsuited to mature people who are already highly qualified. However the West Midlands Training College at Walsall is planning to carry out such a course and this could well be a lead which will be followed elsewhere.

Another problem which discourages Indian and Pakistani teachers is the policy of the Department of Education in refusing to recognise the two-year teacher-training courses in India and Pakistan as granting qualified status in Britain. Up to 1962 these courses were recognised but since then three-year training has been demanded. Since most British teachers are two-year trained, and since an untrained university graduate can be regarded as qualified, this policy seems to be a discouragement to the recruitment of Asiatic teachers.

Teachers from Commonwealth countries could play a large part in easing our teacher shortage, and could in particular be of assistance to children from their own countries who speak little or no English. Clearly such teachers should be as equally qualified as their English colleagues and should not be in any sense second-class teachers for second-class pupils. The Government should as a matter of urgency provide facilities for the training of Commonwealth teachers who are already in this country. A one-year course would bring their length of training into line with modern practice in this country. If they are not to be used it is morally wrong to encourage them to come here and thus waste their skills. They should either be teaching here or they should be at home helping to meet the educational needs of their own countries.

Let me give an example of this waste of talent. MJ, a Pakistani graduate with an Honours Degree in mathematics, taught in Pakistan for nine years. Before coming to England in 1964, he obtained a Bachelor of Education Degree – the Pakistani equivalent of a qualified teacher's certificate. In England he taught in a

IMMIGRATION - A VITAL POLITICAL ISSUE

London school for seven months whilst his qualifications were examined. During this time he existed on a salary of only £7 a week as an unqualified teacher. He had no doubts that his qualifications, once verified, would give him qualified status and an increased salary. During his teaching in London he proved able to adapt himself successfully to English conditions. Then came the bombshell. His qualifications were declared insufficient and he was advised to take a course of training!

MJ left his post and earned a reasonable wage working at nights packing lollies for an ice-cream firm. Britain is desperately short of mathematics teachers. Many London schools have Pakistani pupils who would benefit from individual help, yet MJ, a mathematics graduate and trained teacher, wasted his talents packing lollies!

Luckily, MJ approached me. I was finally able to arrange a one-year course for him which will satisfy the Ministry, but in the meantime MJ is lost to teaching both in England and in Pakistan. If his qualifications were 'insufficient' why was he given a priority voucher for entry to this country as a teacher? If he was not to be used as a teacher then he should not have been admitted at all. Pakistan has enormous educational problems and cannot afford to lose qualified teachers unless they are to make a contribution to educational progress elsewhere.

The cost of educating the children of a large immigrant population, both in money and in reduced efficiency due to larger classes and more difficult teaching problems, is part of the social cost of immigration. Immigrant workers tend to be young. They have a high birth rate and large families. Their children take up a higher proportion of school places than the numbers of adults relative to the whole population. Since dependants of immigrant workers can enter this country freely the number of coloured children in our schools is likely to grow rapidly. More than a third of the arrivals from India and the West Indies in 1964 were children and the pattern continued for 1965.

As more wives join their husbands the number of coloured children born here increases by leaps and bounds. Government

proposals to spread the burden by carrying immigrant children to schools with a lower percentage can only delay the realisation of the need for special aid for the areas affected.

Birmingham and Smethwick, areas with long experience of teaching immigrant children, have both rejected the idea of transporting large numbers of children over considerable distances. In Birmingham this could involve children in travelling up to a sixteen-mile return journey. It is a plan at once unacceptable both to the coloured children who are 'shared out' and to the receiving schools which would have to face an artificial reduction in standards. The real answer is more teachers with special training.

Once all schools in an area have reached the maximum quota then the proportions will have to be further increased. The Department of Education admits that more than about 25 per cent immigrant children in a school presents a situation leading to reduced standards.

Parents of British children will not accept these conditions for long even in limited areas. Education is the key to racial harmony but unless there is some limitation on the numbers of immigrant children presenting themselves at schools education could become a source of racial friction. Either the movement of immigrants into certain areas must be restricted or there must be control of the entry of dependants into the country as a whole.

Teachers oppose any form of racial discrimination and I believe that we should not exploit their good will by imposing impossible tasks upon them. They face, uncomplaining, the problems for which they have neither training nor experience. The politicians must create a situation in which their efforts can be successful.

The problems are not only those of academic progress. A twelve-year-old Indian girl told her classmates that she had been 'married' at the weekend. Parents panicked at the thought of this 'experienced' young lady talking to their schoolgirl daughters. Their fears were allayed when it was found that the 'marriage' was in fact a betrothal and the 'bridegroom' was thousands of miles away in India!

IMMIGRATION - A VITAL POLITICAL ISSUE

While there has been much experimenting in the teaching of English to immigrant children there seems to have been little consideration given to any programme other than that immigrants should attend English schools to be given English education. It is not clear on what premise this programme is based. Even in Smethwick it takes two years for an immigrant child to learn English. Would he not be better taught in his own language?

Experiments in Scotland with Gaelic-speaking children has shown that they learn quicker if they are taught in their own language. Even their progress in English is improved once it ceases to be a rigid, imposed discipline. Since immigrant communities tend to be concentrated could not Pakistani teachers instruct Pakistani children in their own language and likewise with Indians? Surely the form and content of education varies widely from culture to culture. One of the privileges most sought by minorities is the right to use their own language. Why teach small children in a foreign language?

The Lapps of northern Scandinavia, the Danish-German minorities, the Valdostans, South Tyrolese and Slovenes of Italy all have the right to be taught in their own languages. Immigrants come to this country to find employment - not to become Englishmen. Their children will need good English but they also have a right to the traditional education of their homeland, as long as their community provides teachers to make this practicable.

An objection to separate classes or schools is that it is segregation. As long as the provision for minority groups is as good as that for native children and there is equal access to higher education this argument seems to have little weight. Parents could have the right to request transfer for their children to English schools when their understanding of the language was adequate. Probably few would choose to take advantage of this provision before the college or university level but the fact that transfer was possible would avoid political objections. Anyone who knows Indian and Pakistani parents' fears about the anglicising of their children would accept that courses offering the traditional forms

of education would be welcomed. Asiatic teachers at present unable to find suitable employment would find the work congenial and rewarding. At the same time, the removal of the nagging fear that their children are being held back would improve the attitude of white parents to immigrants in general.

If purely education criteria are used separation could well lead to higher standards. In the United States of America twenty-five to forty-five per thousand of Southern Negro high-school students reach national college admission standards. In the integrated North the figure is less than two per thousand. Integration then can only be argued on social grounds. It does not bring educational advantage.

Education is in itself an attraction to immigrants. Since July 1962 more than 53,000 Commonwealth citizens subject to control have entered Britain as students. In the realms of higher education the presence of overseas students is a positive factor and there is no case for restricting this entry except to insist that students who enter to take a course of study do indeed take up the course and do not merely drift into casual employment. On completion of their courses they should return home to put their knowledge at the disposal of their own governments and peoples.

Another aspect of education affected by immigration is that for adults. Many immigrants speak poor English and have had deficient schooling. Some areas, like Smethwick, have had programmes for adult education for immigrants for several years now but much still remains to be done.

All too often the attenders at Institutes and Colleges of Further Education are those who already have made progress in English and general education. The immigrants who speak practically no English, and especially the women, rarely attend. The immigrant community leaders should commend such courses and encourage their people to attend them.

Immigrant mothers who attend ante- and post-natal clinics can be given instruction in simple English at the same time. They could be encouraged to continue their lessons after their attendance at the clinic comes to an end.

IMMIGRATION - A VITAL POLITICAL ISSUE

Radio and television could do a great deal more to help. The BBC's Autumn 1965 programmes for immigrants were a step in the right direction. The great problem here is the wide range of languages spoken even by immigrants from one area of the world. Why cannot English lessons be given by the direct method on television? These would be of equal value to all who speak foreign languages regardless of their origins. There is a wide field here for vigorous enterprise. The results could be infinitely rewarding.

There is usually very little race feeling between young children. Prejudice increases among teenagers both due to the acceptance of adult attitudes and the competitive nature of adolescent relationships in general. For this reason multi-racial youth activities have been very limited. Uniformed organisations such as the Scouts have found little difficulty in running activities for boys of different races, but in the less disciplined, more informal clubs there has been relatively little success. Clubs which have been formed specifically for a multi-racial purpose usually have dwindling numbers of white members, though there have been a few notable exceptions in different parts of the country.

Nation-wide publicity centred on the Sandwell Youth Club in Smethwick when in 1963 it was announced that the club would not accept coloured members in future. In practice, most youth clubs have few coloured applicants, but the Sandwell Youth Club, with its publicly announced ban, was something quite new. The club was run by an ex-Labour town councillor who had much sympathy from Conservative supporters and even Tory councillors. In 1964, when the Conservatives took control of the Borough Council, he was co-opted to the Education Committee. Relations between the new council and the Sandwell Youth Club deteriorated rapidly due mainly to numerous letters to the Press by the club's leader and members expressing strong views on the colour question. As the club used council-owned premises and received various other facilities, the conduct of the club was a matter for the Council to discuss. There were a number of other complaints besides the club's attitude to coloured members. In 1965 the club

was told that it would have to vacate the premises. It moved out into a privately owned building.

I have always held that all clubs, including youth clubs, should have the right to decide their own membership. Most clubs achieve this without any untoward publicity. When however a club takes up a controversial position, such as imposing a 'colour-bar' on membership, then I think that the leaders are making a mistake. No-one would insist on their accepting coloured members, but equally no civic body such as a town council could endorse a colour-bar policy.

The Sandwell Youth Club is better off as a private club making its own rules and owing no responsibility to the Council. I think that it would be a great pity if we cannot have a dual system of youth organisations catering on the one hand for whites and on the other for coloureds. It will be a long time before coloured members are freely and easily accepted into all youth clubs. At present they tend to set up their own organisations, but there is much inter-club activity and surely this is valuable. In time, individual coloured members will join white youth clubs with personal friends and probably vice versa. This will be a gradual and natural process. Any attempts to impose 'integration' immediately or to insist on a 'colour-bar' will only make such progress more difficult.

There is no need to fear the swamping of white clubs. The clubs' management committees will ensure good behaviour by excluding any troublemakers. The acceptance of individuals at their own personal value is the civilised approach. There must be a coherent, progressive policy.

R B Davison in *Commonwealth Immigrants in Britain* sounds a warning note on integrated youth clubs. 'Unless one is prepared to accept that intermarriage is likely to be one of the consequences of the creation of inter-racial clubs, it is better not to embark on this kind of activity.' This is a valid point. It would obviously be wrong to encourage adolescents to mix in multi-racial clubs and then reject sex relationships. Those who advocate integration should ponder this point.

IMMIGRATION - A VITAL POLITICAL ISSUE

It is also unfortunately true that close contact, far from increasing understanding, frequently leads to intolerance. A survey of children's feelings on race-relations showed that 85 per cent of the youngsters at a London comprehensive school had some degree of racial prejudice, while in Lowestoft, where there are no immigrants, there was no racial feeling at all. One of the most serious fallacies of the day is the belief that it is only necessary for people to be integrated for them to live in harmony. All experience is seen to disprove this. The mishandling of relations between young people in schools and clubs could lead to the next generation of adults being more prejudiced than the present one.

The decision is one for parents to make. They have the obligation and responsibility to nurture their children. They must decide with whom their children should associate. There must remain an element of choice for the responsible parent to take. For this reason a uniform rigid pattern of integrated schools and clubs would deprive parents of a fundamental right. In education, as in all other fields, progress must be made slowly and carefully.

PUBLIC HEALTH

One of the great fears raised by immigration is a possible reduction in public health standards. People living in our great cities and crowded industrial towns are ever conscious of the narrow margins of safety existing in overcrowded, inadequate housing. Housewives, waging a never-ending battle against industrial dust and grime in an attempt to turn mean little houses into real homes, are highly critical of any lowering of standards.

Checks on the health of immigrants to this country have been, and remain, rudimentary and easily evaded. In the Commonwealth countries from which most immigrants come, standards of public health are far below those in this country. Such medical certificates as are carried by immigrants are suspect inasmuch as they may have been issued for other purposes and then sold to the prospective entrants.

The problem really falls into two parts. The first is the difficulty of checking against the entry of those who are carrying infectious

diseases; while the second is the whole broad issue of attempting to persuade people from underdeveloped countries to adopt our standards of health and hygiene while they are resident in this country.

There is little doubt that many immigrants have come here in unsatisfactory states of health. Some arrive chronically sick with, for example, tuberculosis. Others have carried infectious diseases such as smallpox. Most are less resistant to the diseases which exist in this country because of a relatively poor diet in their homelands.

However, the problems should be kept in perspective. We should not exaggerate the dangers to health involved. Certainly, with strict checking and control they could be contained. At present this is not happening and this is a cause of resentment among our own native population.

More statistics would be valuable if made available. The Minister of Health, replying to Sir Cyril Osborne's question in the House of Commons which asked if the incidence of tuberculosis among Asian immigrants in Wolverhampton and Birmingham was twenty-five times greater than among the indigenous people, said in May 1965: 'Some local studies have revealed a high incidence of tuberculosis among immigrants, particularly from Pakistan. National morbidity statistics do not distinguish between immigrants and other residents.' It is high time that they did.

After the 1965 outbreak of typhoid in Smethwick there was a widespread call for more stringent health checks. Dr J Briant, the Deputy Medical Officer of Health, said that Smethwick had contained one outbreak but that another might occur if people were let into the country without some sort of health checks. 'I do feel,' he said, 'that with the present situation of overcrowding and the not too high sanitary arrangements in these houses we have got to expect further trouble.'

The Smethwick typhoid outbreak also drew attention to the weakness of the law in dealing with carriers of disease who are not themselves suffering from it. Section 38 of the Public Health

IMMIGRATION — A VITAL POLITICAL ISSUE

Act 1961 gives to Medical Officers of Health the power of compulsory examination of persons suspected of suffering from an infectious disease. There is no power to examine suspected carriers except by agreement. The difficulty of communication with non-English-speaking immigrants, the shyness of Asian women and the suspicion with which immigrants tend to regard officials, make it essential that these powers be extended.

On 31st May 1965 I received an assurance in the House of Commons that the matter was under review by the Ministry of Health. Luckily the 1965 outbreak was among West Indians, among whom only a small minority was unwilling to co-operate. But the need for effective checks and adequate powers is urgent.

The Deputy Medical Officer of Health for Birmingham, Dr W Nicol, spoke in early 1965 of the number of Asians in the city with tuberculosis. 'The number of Asians with tuberculosis is a significant proportion,' he said. 'It is something that concerns us.' The City Council has approached the Government on a number of occasions seeking action. In September 1964 a request for government action followed a report from Dr V H Springett of the Birmingham Chest Clinic. The report urged a thorough medical examination and X-ray in the country of origin, supervised by British Embassy Staff, and a tighter control of international certificates of vaccination against smallpox.

There have been very widespread calls for stricter checks, particularly X-ray examinations of new entrants. The Medical Officer of Health for Bolton, where there were fifteen cases of active tuberculosis among Asians in 1964, has called for such a screening. The Councils of Smethwick, Peterborough, Wolverhampton, Dudley, Ilkley, Chertsey and Bradford have all pressed the Ministry of Health on this matter. Peterborough reported a 25 per cent increase in the TB rate among immigrants in 1964. The Executive Councils of the National Health Service in Warrington and London pressed for X-ray screening. Even Mr Aubrey Jones, then MP for Hall Green in Birmingham, who is well known for his very liberal views on immigration, was

A QUESTION OF COLOUR?

reported by the *Yorkshire Post* on 29th September 1964 as calling for such checks.

The Medical Officer of Health for Bradford reported that the numbers of cases of TB among immigrants had risen from twelve in 1954 to 209 in 1962. In the latter year they comprised almost two-thirds of the total of notified cases. The MoH called for repeated regular X-ray screening, since immigrants were very susceptible to the disease.

Walthamstow reported a disturbing increase in tuberculosis among Pakistanis, while in 1964 Smethwick reported that the proportion of sanatorium beds occupied by immigrants was one third.

In Bradford 150 cases of active TB were discovered among immigrants by mass radiography, while Wolverhampton reported that roughly one-third of its tuberculosis cases were from abroad, though its immigrants' population amounted to only a little over 5 per cent. Bradford reported Asians as between thirteen and thirty times as prone to tuberculosis as English citizens. From Bradford also, the point was made that while at present there was little spreading of the disease to white people from immigrants, increasing integration could lead to such cross infection. Staffordshire's school Medical Officer of Health has announced a scheme for BCG-anti-tuberculosis injections for children of coloured families in South Staffordshire at the age of six or seven if they have been in contact with the disease.

Venereal disease is a serious problem among immigrant males. There is little evidence that many infected persons enter this country but there is a high infection rate among men who, denied by economic circumstances the company of their wives, turn to prostitutes of the lowest order. *Time and Tide* reported in November 1964 that West Indians accounted for half of the increase among males since 1962.

The British Medical Journal of 22nd July 1961 gave an alarming warning of the potential increase in VD due to immigration. It was stated that the incidence of the disease among West Indian men is 36.9 per thousand compared with 1.1 per thousand among

IMMIGRATION - A VITAL POLITICAL ISSUE

men of similar age in the United Kingdom. The Institute of Race Relations reported in *Coloured Immigrants in Britain* that in several towns 50 per cent of the patients attending VD clinics were West Indians. The Minister of Health stated in the Commons that a sample check in 1961 of males treated for gonorrhoea showed 52.8 per cent to be immigrants. In 1964 a similar check produced the figure of 49.6 per cent.

Dr K. Greet, the Secretary of the Department of Christian Citizenship of the Methodist Church, called in 1964 for an examination by the British Medical Association of the problems of VD and illegitimacy. The casual approach of West Indians towards sexual relations results in an illegitimacy rate in the Caribbean of some 70 per cent. It is reported that 51 per cent of the children born to immigrant mothers are illegitimate. While generally the children of immigrant mothers are well cared for, the offspring of casual liaisons between coloured men and white girls are creating a growing problem. Already one in five of all children accommodated in Voluntary Children's Homes are coloured or half-castes. This proportion is rising since it is not easy to place such children in foster homes.

It is difficult to obtain reliable figures for illegitimate births, but the problem has caused much concern. Smethwick's Health Committee proposed the showing of birth-control films. This idea revealed a lack of suitable material with commentaries in immigrant languages.

It has long been realised that birth rates among the nations providing this country with immigrants were two and three times as high as our own. The full significance of this was not realised, since, in the past, statistics revealed that movement into highly civilised urban areas led to dramatic falls in the birth rates among immigrants. Live births among British people have been around sixteen per thousand of the population. In the West Indies the figure is forty-six per thousand. The bombshell, which may prove to be the most significant revelation for a long time, was a birth rate of 122 per thousand among immigrants in Wolverhampton.

A QUESTION OF COLOUR?

If immigrants breed eight times as fast as the local people then in a period of two generations white people may well be in a minority in some areas of the Midlands. In 1963 23 per cent of all live births in Wolverhampton were to immigrant parents. In 1964 the proportion rose to 24 per cent, 793 out of 3,300 live births. The present immigrant population of this country is only about 3 per cent of the total but if the trend continues then the fears of white people becoming a minority in their home districts could well come true.

The need for adequate up-to-date statistics is obvious. The Ministry of Health should make nation-wide investigations and publish its findings. The whole structure of British society may be changing without our realising it.

In Nottingham in 1963-4 one in ten births was of a coloured child. The *News of the World* in a report on immigration on the 10th December 1962 stated: 'Last year, 20,000 West Indians in Birmingham fathered more children than 250,000 whites (430 as against 424).' In the city, coloured births rose steadily in numbers between 1958 and 1963, from 1,283 to 3,659. The percentage of non-white births of the total live births was as follows:

1958	6.8 per cent
1959	8.1 ditto
1960	9.5 ditto
1961	12.5 ditto
1962	15.6 ditto
1963	16.7 ditto

These figures tell their own story.

All this raises the vexed question of the allocation of maternity beds. Places in maternity hospitals are made available on a combination of medical grounds and consideration of home conditions. There has been a general aim to make a bed available for the birth of a mother's first child. The overcrowded and sometimes insanitary conditions in many immigrant households has led to a high proportion of beds being given over to coloured mothers.

IMMIGRATION - A VITAL POLITICAL ISSUE

The Liberal Candidate for South East Leicester has reported that 22 per cent of maternity beds there are occupied by immigrant mothers. The 1960 Annual Report of the Medical Officer of Health for Wolverhampton showed that the 3 per cent immigrant population occupied 25 per cent of the maternity beds. Sir Cyril Osborne, MP, claimed a figure of 70 per cent for Willesden.

In Smethwick, the Medical Officer of Health confirmed that more than half the maternity beds were occupied by immigrants. It is reported to be 'virtually impossible' for a white mother in South Warwickshire to have her first child in hospital.

The problem has been exacerbated by a pressure by immigrant mothers on doctors to recommend a hospital confinement. Refusal of a bed has led to allegations of racial prejudice in the Midlands. Midwives in Smethwick and Wolverhampton have also increased the pressure by refusing to agree to home confinements in the 'filth and squalor' of some immigrant homes. In Birmingham, 86 per cent of coloured mothers live in accommodation with more than two persons to a room compared with only 21 per cent of white mothers.

A Leicester midwife attending a coloured confinement found the family in one bed, expectant mother, father and two other children. Just before the birth she managed to get the two children out of the room but the Indian father remained in bed throughout. His excuse? He worked nights!

Clearly this is a serious social problem and one which can lead to deteriorating race-relations if the situation is not improved. A considerable expansion in the number of maternity beds available is an urgent necessity. As long as sufficient beds are available for white mothers the fact that a higher proportion of immigrant births are in hospital will not be resented. The refusal of beds to English mothers for their first children or for difficult confinements is intolerable. Already there are signs that white mothers are having to take greater risks in home confinements than coloured mothers. In Birmingham 7.8 per cent of white mothers with home confinements needed emergency hospital treatment compared with only 4.5 per cent of coloured mothers.

A QUESTION OF COLOUR?

We have already noted that smallpox, leprosy and typhoid are a particular threat, while *Lymphogranuloma venereum*, a tropical form of syphilis, has been introduced into Britain for the first time. This completely refutes the argument that immigrants catch their diseases in this country. Clearly, tropical diseases are brought here by arrivals from the tropics. Only the strictest screening will prevent the introduction of a whole range of tropical diseases into Britain.

In 1965, there were 343 cases of leprosy registered in the United Kingdom. It has been reported to the Ministry of Health that most cases are immigrants to this country.

A Bradford doctor wrote to me recently: 'Bradford is now one of the most unhealthy cities in the country, with a TB rate thirty times the national average. Over 60 per cent of the VD cases now occur among the 5 per cent immigrant community. Overcrowding is rife in immigration areas (in some small houses registered votes alone number fifteen or more). Filthy, dangerous conditions are created which spread outwards. This leads to disillusionment among those who have struggled for a lifetime to reach a state of cleanliness and respectability.' It is impossible to reject such testimony as ignorant prejudice.

The pressure from local authorities and the British Medical Association for health checks at the points of entry has not been successful, though in August 1965 it was announced that immigrants would in future be expected to produce evidence of a medical check before leaving home. The Ministry of Health claims that comprehensive checks are impractical. X-ray equipment has, however, been installed at London Airport. If this were used to check all immigrants then at least some progress would be being made. This is not so. 'X-rays are carried out at the discretion of the Medical Officer who sees the immigrants as they come in. If any of them look a bit seedy the doctor can pick them out and have them X-rayed.' So said a Ministry spokesman to a reporter of the *Birmingham Evening Mail*.

Re-entrants should also be examined. A Pakistani with active TB recently entered Britain without check because he had

IMMIGRATION — A VITAL POLITICAL ISSUE

previously been resident here. Dependants are not at present subject to any check. Why ever not? In the first six weeks of X-ray examination at London Airport 150 immigrants were checked: three active and two non-active cases of TB were found. This is a high proportion but many more must be slipping past.

The medical examination should ideally be carried out before embarkation, so that there is no question of what to do with the chronic sick who arrive. Six months in hospital for a new arrival costs the tax-payer about £1,000. It would be more effective and far cheaper to examine all would-be immigrants before they leave for Britain. The nation's health is at stake. Action should be immediate and effective.

In all these fields—family and social life, employment, housing, education and health—mass immigration presents problems. That these problems have not got out of hand reflects the greatest credit on the police, employers and workers, neighbours, teachers, doctors and nurses. Every difficulty is part of the price we have to pay for the very doubtful economic advantages of immigration.

Smethwick—and that Election

ON the twin issues of immigration and race-relations the political parties have very poor records. There has been far too little plain speaking and a great deal too much double-talk designed to pacify the electorate.

The Labour Party represents most of the constituencies heavily affected by immigration. Many Labour MPs and local party organisations have known full well the unhappiness and misery being created in their areas and yet they have remained silent. Why have they not spoken up for the working class which they claim to represent? Why have they not protested against the squalid conditions created in our great cities?

The answer would appear to be two-fold. Firstly, the Labour movement has believed passionately in equality and the solidarity of the workers of every race and nationality. This made the exclusion of immigrants, most of whom were 'working class victims of imperialism', anathema to the doctrinaire Socialist.

Secondly, the Labour Party misjudged the electoral significance of immigration. Labour leaders believed that, in any argument over control, popular sympathy could be roused by talk of 'colour-bar' and 'discrimination'. It was also assumed that the immigrants would automatically vote for their Socialist friends. In the event, the former estimate proved completely wrong and the latter only partly right. For the moment, however, the plaudits of the Left drowned the murmurs of protest from the electors.

Many leading Labour politicians were publicly committed to membership of bodies opposing apartheid. Anthony Wedgwood Benn, now Postmaster General, was a founder of the Movement for Colonial Freedom and a signatory to the Declaration of the

SMETHWICK - AND THAT ELECTION

Southern African Freedom Group. Fenner Brockway, now Lord Brockway, served on the National Committee of the Anti-Apartheid Movement, was a sponsor of Christian Action and of the Movement for Colonial Freedom. He also signed the Southern African Freedom Group's Declaration.

Barbara Castle, formerly in Charge of Overseas Aid in the Labour Government, was a sponsor of the Movement for Colonial Freedom and a former Chairman of the Anti-Apartheid Movement. Sir Dingle Foot was Chairman of the Southern African Freedom Group at the time of its Declaration. He is now Solicitor General in the Labour Government. Anthony Greenwood has been Treasurer of the Movement for Colonial Freedom. Jennie Lee was Treasurer of the Movement for Colonial Freedom and a signatory of the Declaration of the Southern African Freedom Group. Prominent back-bench Labour Members connected with such bodies are David Ennals, Michael Foot, Julius Silverman and John Stonehouse.

This great mass of opinion within the Labour Party made its attitude to immigration control inevitable. The need to conciliate the Left wing made it impossible for the late Hugh Gaitskell, then Leader of the Opposition, to take a firm line, even had he been so inclined. Since most Commonwealth citizens are coloured any restrictions on entry into this country must bear most heavily on coloured people. For this reason the timid approaches towards legislation by the Conservative Government were violently opposed.

'We on this side are clear in our attitude towards restricted immigration. I think I speak for my Right Hon and Hon Friends by saying we are categorically against it.' So spoke Arthur Bottomley in 1958, following it up a little later with: 'The central principle on which our status in the Commonwealth is largely dependent is the "open door" to all Commonwealth citizens. If we believe in the importance of our great Commonwealth, we should do nothing in the slightest degree to undermine that principle.'

When earlier I wrote of the situation in the United States of

A QUESTION OF COLOUR?

America I made the point that violent demonstrations tend to defeat their own ends. Here in Britain the resentment against immigrants which led to the Notting Hill and Nottingham riots in 1958 delayed the formation of a rational policy of strictly limiting immigration.

The genuine sense of revulsion at the attacks on innocent coloured people diverted attention from the basic problem. Opponents of immigration went unheeded by a public anxious to reject Fascism and violence. No politicians were prepared to face up to the facts that resentment and exasperation must have some cause. It was popular and easy to condemn, difficult to try to find solutions to the fundamental problems.

I was perhaps the first politician to say bluntly that I would not condemn people who expressed their strong feelings in earthy language. I alone tried to differentiate between the political exploitation of emotions and the popular expression of such feelings. I have always roundly condemned the use of the 'nigger neighbour' slogan for political ends, but a citizen may use such a phrase to express his utter frustration and helplessness. Then I would respectfully suggest that the politician who hears should get on with the job of removing the root cause rather than preaching a sermon. We have had too much of the 'holier than thou' prattle from politicians during the last decade. Strong popular feeling should be channelled into positive action. In this way the politician acts as a safety valve and reduces the likelihood of violent expression.

This has been one of the functions of the Smethwick Conservative Party. Smethwick has known no racial violence despite its manifold difficulties. Too many politicians waited to see 'which way the cat would jump' on immigration. Smethwick Tories can point proudly to their pioneering efforts which got precious little encouragement from outside.

However, at least from 1955 onwards a minority of Tory back-benchers were sufficiently alarmed by events to raise the question of the control of immigration in the House of Commons. In this Norman Pannell and Cyril Osborne were prominent. They

SMETHWICK - AND THAT ELECTION

received little encouragement from the Government. Not until 1960, when the Indian and Pakistani governments relaxed their control over emigrants, did the real flood of immigration to this country commence. The General Election of October 1959 had indicated that in some areas the racial problem was causing concern. Particularly in the Midlands local Conservative Associations began to press the Government for restrictive measures. Smethwick was one of the foremost in making representations for immigration control.

Popular feeling made itself felt through the creation of such bodies as the Birmingham Immigration Control Association. Pressure on the Government from all quarters was increased during the next twelve months. It took a long time, however, to convince those who were unfamiliar with the problems at first hand that legislative action was needed.

In 1960, total immigration rose to a warning figure of more than 60,000, but while the Government dithered the 1961 entry reached 130,000 including 66,000 from the West Indies and 50,000 from the Indian sub-continent. At long last the Government was forced to act and in November 1961 the Commonwealth Immigrants Bill was introduced.

This was a very mild and limited measure applying only to those coming here from the Commonwealth to work. No limitation was placed on students or visitors and the wives and dependants of immigrants were not to be controlled by the voucher system proposed. The number of immigrants to be allowed into the country was left to the discretion of the Home Secretary.

Three categories of immigrants were defined. 'A' vouchers were to be granted to workers proceeding to specific jobs arranged before they left home. 'B' vouchers were for skilled men and 'C' vouchers for the unskilled immigrants. The restrictions were to apply regardless of race or colour.

The debates on the Bill were long and acrimonious. The fact that the restrictions were not to apply to Southern Irish immigrants was used by the Opposition to demonstrate the discriminatory nature of the proposals. The Government indicated in

debate that the conditions of the Bill would not be applied with any very great rigour.

Since 1962 Labour spokesmen have tried to suggest that they did not oppose immigration control as such, but merely fought against the provisions of the Bill. This may be a nice distinction in the minds of politicians with guilty consciences, but in point of fact Labour fought tooth and nail against control. The only amendments moved were to remove certain countries from the Bill's sphere of operations. Patrick Gordon Walker, Shadow Home Secretary, and Mr Gaitskell made their positions perfectly clear as did Conservative leaders and MPs. Their recorded words should be studied carefully by anyone seeking to ascertain the facts.

R A Butler, now Lord Butler, then the Home Secretary, opened the Second Reading Debate on 16th November 1961. He said: 'It is only after long and anxious consideration that the Government have decided to ask Parliament for power to control immigration from the Commonwealth.' The Bill, he claimed, was 'liberally conceived'. It was necessary to impose some control because 'a sizeable part of the entire population of the earth is at present legally entitled to come and stay in this densely populated country'. Mr Butler went on to point out the danger to race-relations which could arise from mass immigration. 'We . . . are working in a period of full employment. It does not take much imagination to realise what might happen if there should be a recession of trade and immigrants are competing for jobs with other people in this country.' Finally, he gave a clear assurance: 'The Bill is drafted so that there is no racial discrimination.'

Such a moderate and restrained presentation of a limited measure ought to have been met with all-Party agreement, but this was not to be. Mr Gordon Walker, leading for the Labour Opposition, moved that 'This House declines to give a Second Reading . . . to a Bill which contains barefaced, open race discrimination.' Any suggestion that he favoured control is demolished by his subsequent declaration: 'At that meeting [one of Commonwealth Prime Ministers] the question of all barriers to movement in the

SMETHWICK - AND THAT ELECTION

Commonwealth ought to have been discussed. There are many barriers. I deplore them.' What could be clearer than that? I described it at the time as a 'let 'em all come' policy. I see no reason to change the description. Mr Gordon Walker ended with these words: 'We bitterly oppose the Bill and will resist it.'

Much of the debate turned on the question of discrimination. Was the Bill unfair towards coloured Commonwealth citizens just because they were coloured? Sir Cyril Osborne, in a continuously interrupted speech, put the position from a Tory viewpoint with great clarity. He said: 'The New Zealanders, the Australians and the Canadians are not coming here in great numbers, and that has nothing to do with the colour of their skin. They are not coming here because their standard of living is so very much higher than ours and therefore there is no temptation for them to come. The problem is nothing to do with skin. The real test is the overwhelming numbers and the poverty.'

Sir Cyril then proceeded to read a letter sent on behalf of Hugh Gaitskell. This stated: 'The Labour Party is opposed to restriction of immigrants as every Commonwealth citizen has the right as a British subject to come to this country at will.'

Mr C Royle, Labour MP for Salford West, represented the extreme Socialist position on the racial issue. He suggested, while acknowledging the exaggeration, that '... world peace will not be assured until everybody in the world is coffee-coloured'.

Mr Gaitskell, who wound up for the Opposition, emphasised Labour's rejection of control. 'The immigrants,' he said, 'are healthy, law-abiding and at work. I beg the Government now to drop this miserable, shameful, shabby Bill.'

All this is quite clear. Labour opposed the Bill in principle, delayed its passage through Parliament and sought to make political capital from the situation which had arisen. While the Conservative Government must accept responsibility for the delay in introducing a measure of control, the Labour Party stands condemned for its blindness and its utter failure to speak for the very people it claims to champion.

At this point immigration became a fundamental political issue.

The Labour Party chose to make it so. They sowed the wind and in the following General Election they reaped the whirlwind.

On Second Reading, in committee, and on Third Reading they opposed the Bill which offered the only gleam of hope to those who felt themselves overwhelmed by immigration. They took up a position which was vulnerable to political attack and suffered accordingly. Surely they themselves now realise that to say: '[The Bill] betrays one of our most cherished traditions, the tradition of admitting citizens of the Commonwealth to this country regardless of colour, creed or numbers', was exaggerated nonsense, yet this was the position of Eric Fletcher, now a member of the Labour Government. Another Minister-to-be, Denis Howell, said: 'Naturally I want the open door policy, not least for moral and ethical reasons.' The Labour Party, quite deliberately, made immigration a political issue. They only complained when they found it to be an unpopular platform.

The Act was not finally passed and brought into force until July 1962. It then showed some result but the failure to act quickly allowed large numbers of immigrants to arrive before the operative date. Ninety-five thousand immigrants poured in during the first six months of 1962, making a total of 225,000 since the beginning of 1961, and a grand total of well over 600,000 since 1955.

The question may be asked, why did not local Labour Parties object to their leaders' handling of the situation? The answer lies partly in the strong Left-wing sympathies of the constituency parties. There was also a strong desire to maintain Party unity at a time when the Tory Government appeared to be weakening. Finally, in some areas it was plainly held that any loss of electoral support on the issue would be more than made up by the immigrants' votes.

Since so many immigrants had settled in safe Labour seats some small abstention could be contained without difficulty. In some areas, such as the Midlands, this view did not commend itself to all Labour Party workers. In Smethwick the divisions

SMETHWICK - AND THAT ELECTION

led to a withdrawal of support by a number of party stalwarts. However most party members accepted the party line, and not until the 1964 General Election was its effect seen clearly.

The reasons why the Conservatives did not, in general, take up the immigration issue are more subtle. Most Tory leaders represented constituencies where there were few immigrants. The Conservatives still championed 'the Empire' and viewed the Commonwealth with paternalism. Experience of coloured people was limited for most Tory MPs to undergraduates, doctors, technical trainees or diplomats. They just could not conceive the situation in the decaying suburbs of the great cities.

The small number of Conservatives who had pressed for years for control of immigration were regarded as 'hotheads'. Control was imposed reluctantly by a party which was only half convinced of its necessity.

What of Tory candidates in the affected areas? Most of these were faced with large Labour majorities and hoped to graduate to more salubrious country seats for later elections. In the industrial constituencies it was felt there was no point in creating unpleasantness. Immigration was a subject arousing a good deal of emotion. It was easier, more pleasant, and more likely to create a favourable impression at Central Office if the issue was left alone. In any case, it was a problem to be left behind after the election when transferring to a better seat. Only those Conservative who felt strongly about the issue themselves, or who were convinced that they could win in their present constituencies, were likely to face the storm which gathered about the heads of those who took a firm line.

Alan Shuttleworth, writing in *Colour and the British Electorate*, put the position this way. 'There is one reason why a candidate who would like to make use of the immigration issue might not do so. It requires a certain amount of courage and political energy. It is necessary to fight an unorthodox campaign, to leave behind much of the comforting routine and go out on a limb. You cannot just copy out the Central Office draft for your manifesto. You have to face vituperation from opponents and

from the Press, and probably disapproval from Conservative Headquarters. You receive the full glare of publicity. All these pressures which have, at least until now, been brought to bear against an anti-immigration candidate require some determination to overcome.' To that I can only add a heartfelt 'Amen!'

As the political situation polarised after the passing of the Immigration Act it became clear that in some areas at least the Labour Party's attitude was causing a loss of electoral support. When the Act came up for renewal in November 1963 Mr Gordon Walker was tactfully absent from the House and thus avoided having to cast a vote. Many other Labour leaders were nervous about the effect of their policy and they became extremely sensitive on the subject.

By March 1964 the position had been reached where, after a visit to Smethwick, Harold Wilson, then leader of the Labour Opposition, made a bitter personal attack on me during a television interview. Such an unprecedented action by a senior politician against a relatively unknown individual candidate indicates the strength of feeling in the Labour Party. Quite clearly they had decided that something must be done to 'scare off' Tory candidates from taking a firm line on immigration, and that the Smethwick candidate, as the chief offender, should be subjected to attack *pour encourager les autres*.

I seriously considered taking legal action against Mr Wilson. Had I won any such action it would probably have prevented the flood of wild accusations which were levelled at my colleagues and myself during the following months.

Meanwhile in Parliament the Government had been forced by pressure of events first of all to limit the proportion of the total of immigrants to be allowed from any one source, and secondly, to cease the issue of 'C' vouchers to the unskilled worker with no specific job. The applications of some 300,000 unskilled, would-be immigrants were held in abeyance.

Assuming lack of control, these 300,000, probably a million with their families, might well have descended upon us with results which beggar the imagination. Even so, up to October

SMETHWICK - AND THAT ELECTION

1964 50,000 voucher holders and 65,000 dependants entered this country officially, and a considerable number came in by devious unauthorised means. The Act saved us from being completely swamped but it still left a considerable flow of coloured people entering at a rate far higher than could properly be housed.

When the General Election of 1964 was fought the probability that there would be four million coloured people in this country by the end of the century was already known to those who had access to the figures. This is almost 6 per cent of the total population forecast. Frankly, it is amazing that in so few areas was the issue debated or even discussed at all.

The tacit conspiracy of silence between the party leaders was a national tragedy and the very negation of democracy. The people have the right to know the facts before they cast their votes. In only a handful of constituencies were the alarming facts about immigration clearly made available to the electors. In Smethwick, where the issues were clear, the electorate behaved quite differently from any other constituency. It is certain that the whole Election result would have been different had the Conservatives as a party decided to champion the cause of those opposed to mass immigration.

The manifestos of the parties issued for the Election were vague and circumspect on the issue of immigration. Labour, hedging in the face of mounting criticism, said: 'Labour accepts that the number of immigrants entering the United Kingdom must be limited. Until a satisfactory agreement can be negotiated with the Commonwealth a Labour Government will retain immigration control.'

The Tories were equally unspecific: 'We shall ensure that the working of the Commonwealth Immigrants Act which we passed in 1962 against bitter Labour Party opposition is fair and effective.' The Liberals were, apparently, unaware of the existence of the problem.

Despite the lack of national discussion immigration was undoubtedly a major issue in a score of constituencies. In Smethwick it was the main talking-point. The largest single factor in

Conservative success there was the clearly established position as spokesman for the local people which I had been able to build up during the long debates on the immigration issue.

Smethwick is a county borough of some 68,000 inhabitants, being surrounded by Birmingham and the Black Country conurbation. The town was the cradle of the Industrial Revolution. Here Bolton and Watt had their foundry. Here the first gas illuminations celebrated victory in the Napoleonic Wars.

Many of Smethwick's homes date back to the nineteenth century and there is a chronic housing shortage. The town is completely built up—it is impossible to build even one house without demolition and redevelopment. In 1955 four thousand families were on the Council's Housing List. By 1964, when the Conservatives took control, the number had been reduced to only 3,920 despite the building of multi-storey flats.

The social services suffer from a shortage of recruits in an unattractive area. This has made for difficulties in Education, the Health Department and the Council's services in general.

Political control from 1945 was in the hands of the Labour Party with a huge majority. Not until 1955 did the Conservative Opposition begin to display much energy and enterprise. In the ensuing years the Socialists were gradually driven on to the defensive and in the years 1961 to 1964 were completely routed. In 1955 when I gained a seat on the local Council I was one of a group of only five Conservatives in a Council of thirty-two. In 1965 only seven Labour members remained.

The issue of immigration had therefore been fought out against a background of social difficulty, shortages of houses, school places, teachers, health inspectors, architects, refuse collectors, street cleaners and policemen. The actions of the parties were conditioned by the situation in the town. Any assessment of their policies must take into account the problems they had to face.

Smethwick had no racial difficulties before 1957, but by 1959 the influx of immigrants was becoming a flood. As Conservative candidate at the General Election of that year I held three public

SMETHWICK - AND THAT ELECTION

meetings. At each one members of the audience demanded that something be done to control the entry of Commonwealth immigrants. After the meetings they told me of the disruption of their lives in quiet roads by overcrowding and noise and squalor. I pledged myself to press for immigration control.

In the months following, the Conservative Party investigated numerous complaints. So appalled were Tory councillors that letters were despatched to Mr Butler, the then Home Secretary, and to Harold Gurden, MP for Selly Oak, the Secretary of the Birmingham Group of Conservative Members of Parliament, calling for a measure of immigration control.

My viewpoint was expressed clearly in 1959 and I have not deviated from it at all. I said in the local Press: 'Immigration into this country should be limited to persons of sound health, who have jobs and living accommodation arranged before they enter. Preference should be given to persons holding British passports. Immigrants should not be allowed to remain here without working nor to overcrowd their housing accommodation.' This has been our basic Smethwick philosophy. There was and still is no colour prejudice at all. I have stuck to my guns through thick and thin. How many other politicians can say the same?

The Commonwealth Immigration Act of 1962 was generally welcomed in Smethwick but the flood of immigrants in the months before it came into operation placed an intolerable strain on our social services. The conditions about which residents complained in 1959 were multiplied many times over by 1962. In 1963 Smethwick had the highest proportion of immigrants in its population of any county borough in Britain. The local Labour Party had given full support to the Opposition in its tactics of delaying control. People naturally turned to the Conservatives. There was a continuous pressure for even stricter control and for an end to the abuses of overcrowding and insanitary conditions.

The failure of Mr Gordon Walker to represent the strongly held views of his constituents was an added frustration for

Smethwick people. It led to a somewhat amusing incident. During a debate on Education in the Commons a few months before the Election Mr Gordon Walker was expected to refer to the Smethwick Conservatives. At the request of the then Minister of Education, Sir Edward Boyle, I travelled to Westminster to give a first-hand account of our policy and actions. As Sir Edward was detained in the Chamber I passed on my message through John Wells, MP for Maidstone, and the previous Tory candidate for Smethwick. This administrative accident proved useful to Sir Edward. When later challenged by Mr Gordon Walker about my visit he was able to claim that we had not met!

In the meantime I had described Smethwick's frustration to John Wells, who expressed complete sympathy. That weekend I wrote an article for the *Smethwick Telephone* criticising Mr Gordon Walker. 'From this time on Smethwick has no MP', I wrote, and then indicated that until such time as I could take over the representation, 'John Wells, our old friend, would express our viewpoints'. This seemed to me a fairly innocent piece of rhetoric, but on publication all hell broke loose. Mr Gordon Walker complained to the Labour Chief Whip that John Wells was taking over his constituency. The Labour Chief Whip threatened the Government Chief Whip, Sir Martin Redmayne, that unless a withdrawal was obtained the matter would be raised as a question of Parliamentary Privilege. I found myself faced with the threat of being hauled before the Bar of the House together with a completely innocent, friendly MP. Discretion being the better part of valour, I soothed Mr Gordon Walker's ruffled pride with a written statement making clear that we accepted that he was still, for the moment, the *de facto* MP for Smethwick. However, Mr Gordon Walker's touchiness was regarded as just one more sign that he was rattled and another encouragement to the Smethwick Tories to press him harder.

The Smethwick Conservative Party always hoped to create and retain friendly relations with the immigrant communities in the town, and to avoid their being brought into local politics. Late in 1962 Tory leaders and officers of the Indian Workers' Association

SMETHWICK - AND THAT ELECTION

met to discuss problems of mutual interest. The meeting appeared to be a useful preliminary to closer co-operation.

Later my wife, and the wife of the Chairman of the Conservative Association, invited the wives of the officers of the Indian Workers' Association to tea.

For the moment relations seemed set fair but the political activities of the Indian leaders destroyed the hopes which we had cherished. They called on immigrants to 'cast an anti-Tory vote' at the Municipal Elections. Our efforts had been in vain. The immigrant organisations had thrown in their lot politically with the Labour Party. They had fallen for the 'we are your friends' line and were not to be disillusioned until the Labour Government introduced stricter measures of control in 1965.

Despite support from the immigrant organisations Smethwick Labour Party suffered heavy reverses at the 1963 Elections, and only retained control of the Council by their monopoly of the aldermanic seats. In May 1964 the Tories won a further sweeping municipal victory and gained control for the first time since 1945.

However, the time taken to gain control of the Borough Council saw a deteriorating situation. In 1963 Conservative councillors and parents instituted 'vigilante patrols' in one part of the town after a series of complaints about the molestation of women and girls by immigrants. After a period of this the local newspaper reported all quiet again, but individual incidents still caused grave concern. My wife and I saw two schoolgirls leave a multi-occupied house late at night. An Indian leader's claim that the girls were 'social workers' hardly satisfied those deeply concerned with moral welfare. These were worrying months while Labour's palsied fingers were being prised from the controls in Smethwick.

At the 1964 General Election immigration was a vital issue - though it was never treated within Smethwick with the sensationalism which characterised the outside reporting of events in the town. The Conservative position was made perfectly clear.

Strict control, coupled with measures to end overcrowding and overstrained social services, was the policy advocated.

The Labour Party's viewpoint was more ambiguous. Mr Gordon Walker had been Shadow Home Secretary during the House of Commons debate on the Immigration Bill. He was regarded locally as being personally opposed to control and his vague Election speeches did little to dispel this belief.

From the beginning it appeared to be the policy of the local Labour Party to attempt to discredit my candidature for the Conservative Party by complaining of a racialist approach. Just before the Election Harold Wilson visited Smethwick to address a meeting of Labour Party workers. From this meeting dated the new Labour tactics. Instead of arguing the immigration issue by proposals and counter-suggestions they began to attack me personally and to seek to isolate the Smethwick Conservative Association from the Tory Party nationally. That this was a policy formulated at top level was shown by the bitter attack on me made a few days later. Mr Wilson, speaking in the *Panorama* programme on television, criticised me rather than my politics, and called upon the Prime Minister to repudiate me. He clearly implied that I had used, or caused to be used, the 'If you want a nigger for a neighbour, vote Labour' slogan. This was completely untrue. The damage, however, was done. Local Labour supporters felt that they were hitting back and the campaign of insult and denigration was well and truly launched.

Mr Gordon Walker took up the issue and concentrated on it. His main attempt was to persuade Conservative Central Office, or some major Tory politician, to appear to disown the Smethwick party. Even before the Conservative campaign opened he was accusing us of stirring up the race problem. During the campaign an almost unprecedented leaflet was issued attacking me personally. Only my restraint in refusing to reply in kind kept the Smethwick Election from degenerating still further into a gutter brawl. My party and I kept to the issues and fought on policies rather than personalities. It is to the credit of the electors that they gave support to the more reasonable cause.

SMETHWICK — AND THAT ELECTION

Mr Gordon Walker's position as a Privy Councillor and Shadow Foreign Secretary ensured the maximum publicity for the charges against the Smethwick Conservatives. The presence of numerous newspaper and television reporters covering the Election in a town which had shown a persistent anti-Labour trend over the previous three years made sure that the arguments were presented to a world-wide audience. The reporters were intensely pre-occupied with the colour problem. The comments of the candidates on any subject other than immigration were either ignored or given only the most cursory mention. Every word on the issue of inter-racial relations was given great prominence.

At each of my daily Press conferences I took a different topic for discussion but the questions to me were based on the one subject only. Credit must be given to Jack Foster of the *Birmingham Post* who collated the points I made on other topics and gave them prominence in a major article, but one column could not counteract the flood of words which flowed from Smethwick to every corner of the world on the subject of immigration.

The natural tendency of the Press to build up a story and to over-simplify the issues was responsible for much of the unfortunate misunderstanding of the Smethwick campaign which, once widespread, still lingers in some quarters. The deliberate policy of newspapers which consciously sought to propagate a 'liberal' policy did not help. When, in an attempt to avoid irrelevancies, I declined to discuss the internal politics of South Africa, the *Guardian* hinted that I was being cautious because of a wish to hide my views from the public. When I spoke of the problems caused by mass immigration *The Times* took me to task for doing so. In these circumstances a candidate could not hope to be reported favourably. Whatever was said or was not said was bound to be condemned by someone.

The much publicised clash of the reporting of my adoption-meeting speech by the *Birmingham Post* indicates how even a newspaper which usually reports events in a most sober fashion could get carried away in the seeking for sensational headlines

when dealing with the colour issue. Speaking of Labour's proposals to give special government aid to regions with large concentrations of immigrants, I welcomed the scheme if the aid was to be for local authorities to use to improve their services, particularly housing, for all of their citizens. 'However,' I said, 'if the proposal is to give special aid to one section of the community, if as suggested, for example, that immigrants should be housed before those who have waited for years on the housing lists, then there will be an explosion.'

After the meeting the young reporter of the *Post* who was covering my adoption asked: 'What do you mean by an explosion? Do you mean race-riots?' I replied: 'I mean there would be protests - and I should be leading them!' The next morning the *Post* headline read: 'Race-riots if Labour Wins—Griffiths!' You are the judge of that heading's fairness. In my opinion this kind of sensational reporting was bound to increase the artificial tension which was being created.

The Labour Party used the mounting excitement to good effect. A letter from Mr Gordon Walker to Sir Alec Douglas Home called on the Tory leader to repudiate his Smethwick candidate. Sir Alec would have none of it. In his written reply, and again on television, he made clear that he fully accepted my frequently stated position of complete support for the policies of the party.

In an attempt to clarify the confused situation I set out my proposals in a ten-point programme. This policy statement was issued only after it had been considered both locally and nationally by party committees. Once the go-ahead was received from London the statement was widely publicised. It was in general well received but it was too late to have the calming effect which was its aim. The plan made the following points:

'Immigration is an issue which must be faced nationally though its effects are concentrated in only a few localities.

'Smethwick is the second most densely built-up town in the country. There are 4,000 families waiting to be rehoused. There is no building land so houses can only be built after clearing areas

SMETHWICK - AND THAT ELECTION

of old property. To this situation has been added the highest concentration of immigrants in any British county borough. Many of those immigrants are illiterate and come from villages in India where overcrowding is common and sanitary arrangements rudimentary. It is no use pretending that problems do not arise under these circumstances. Fortunately in Smethwick the Conservative Party has been prepared to face up to these difficulties and offer practical solutions.

'As Parliamentary Candidate I would put forward the following ten points as my personal contribution to the discussions which must take place. The Government has a good record of immigration control but these points coming from an area directly affected may point the way ahead.

(1) I favour control of all immigration. This is no colour-bar - it is just common sense while housing shortages remain.

(2) The sheer number of unskilled immigrants has led to problems due to their general social background being different from our own.

A ban on unskilled immigration for, say, five years would help those already here to settle in and be accepted. During such a period numbers would fall as some immigrants go home. This would reduce overcrowding.

(3) Immigrants frequently borrow the fare to Britain.

If they cannot find work they cannot afford to go home. We should offer assisted passages back home - once only.

(4) Immigrants must be treated exactly as other people. They are not to be over- or under-privileged. They must keep within the law and not affront our social customs. "When in Rome . . ." We in our turn should respect their culture.

(5) Criminals and the chronic sick should be kept out as they cause irritation and damage the reputation of the majority.

(6) Immigrants guilty of indictable crime should be deported. This would be a valuable deterrent.

(7) Immigrant children should be given special help to learn English quickly. They can help teach their parents our ways and ideas.

(8) "Integration" insults the ancient culture of the Sikhs, Smethwick's largest immigrant group. They should be allowed to keep their identity – just as we wish to keep ours. Friendly co-operation is the ideal.

(9) Local leaders both white and coloured should work for harmony. To encourage immigrants to vote for one political party or to oppose one party causes unnecessary tension.

(10) Sensationalism in speeches, written articles or newspaper reports merely causes ill-feeling and is to be deplored, but there must be serious discussion of the problem without accusations of "colour-bar".

I still believe that these ten points were reasonable and broadly acceptable to those who had no political axe to grind. They are certainly neither immoderate nor racist.

The Liberal candidate, David Hugill, made no impact on the Smethwick electorate and lost his deposit at the polls. His only inspired contribution to the campaign was to suggest that Mr Gordon Walker might stand down in his favour. My reaction, 'Who is Mr Hugill?', was echoed by the majority of the electorate who regarded his intervention as an unnecessary complication.

Of more interest was the arrival on the scene of Dudley Davies. A stranger to the town, Mr Davies hailed from Chalfont St Peter. He declared himself to be opposed to immigration but his nomination paper was promptly signed by Mr Luther Thomas, leader of the West Indian Unity Association. Mr Davies issued some duplicated leaflets but did little or no active campaigning. A popular view in Smethwick was that his candidature was inspired by the Labour Party to split the 'anti-immigrant' vote. No evidence of any such plot was discovered despite wide investigation by the Press. I consider it to be unfounded but it is probable that an element of suspicion accounts, in part at least,

SMETHWICK – AND THAT ELECTION

for the very low vote – 262 – which Mr Davies received. I was hopeful that extremist support for Mr Davies would be seen as an indication that my own position was moderate but in fact many electors did not even know of his candidature until they saw his name on the ballot paper.

The Election was marked by a minor intervention from outside. The prospect of toppling Mr Gordon Walker was attractive to very many people outside the ranks of the Conservative Party. Elements from the extreme Right made their presence felt by 'Keep Britain White' slogans painted on walls and by the infamous 'Nigger Neighbour' posters. These latter afford an excellent example of how events, trivial in themselves, could be magnified.

Ever since Mr Gordon Walker complained in 1963 that children had called after him: 'If you want a nigger for a neighbour – vote Labour' the phrase had been current in Smethwick and elsewhere. The Conservatives, of course, completely dissociated themselves from the slogan.

During the next twelve months, however, it came to represent the commonly expressed attitude of those who, suffering directly from the situation brought about by overcrowding and dirty conditions, used it to express their exasperation with the attitude of Smethwick's Labour Member of Parliament. Controversy and complaint merely gave it wider currency. I had been much criticised for refusing to condemn anyone who used the phrase. I still utterly deplore its use as a political rallying call but I will certainly not criticise those who use it to express their protest against politicians who preach a morality they are not called upon, by choice or circumstances, to practise.

Early in the Election campaign Mr Colin Jordan's National Socialists posted up small stickers with the slogan: 'If you want a nigger for a neighbour – vote Liberal or Labour.' These stickers were magnified into posters in the excited reporting. My repudiation of the slogan and its publishers, unfortunately, was not so widely reported. This was the sum total of Right-wing intervention but many people are still under the completely mistaken impression that the election in Smethwick was marked

by massive race-hate publicity. Nothing is further from the truth.

Mr Gordon Walker ably exploited the situation in Smethwick. He issued separate – and different – leaflets to each racial group. One third of the personal message in his election address was concerned with immigration. Previous to the Election a special Labour leaflet on immigration was delivered to each door and just before the poll yet another Socialist immigration leaflet was widely distributed.

This is not only the Conservative view. Paul Foot in *Immigration and Race in British Politics* quotes a Birmingham MP as saying: 'Look at Patrick. He never left the subject alone. You couldn't open a local paper without reading what he said about immigration.' Mr Foot concludes: 'The racial bitterness stirred up in Smethwick over the last few years could well continue for a generation. For this Patrick Gordon Walker must take his share of responsibility.'

After the Election the *Birmingham Evening Mail* spoke in similar terms but the smear tactics against me had their effect after the deliberate campaign to discredit the local Tory Party as being racist. There was no atom of truth in this, as the facts show.

My Election address was issued to all electors regardless of race or colour. It drew attention to my firm stand against immigration and my intention to continue the battle. I called for improved social conditions and stressed my local knowledge of the constituency and its people.

Immigration was not given undue prominence in my leaflet which was based on broad appeal. Only one point out of seven referred to the topic. The address contained nothing remotely offensive to coloured people. Generally, it put forward the Conservative Party policy with a clearly defined local approach. It was well received.

In a brief reply to Labour's mass of Election literature two last-minute leaflets were issued. One reminded the electors of the fine record of the new Conservative Council and the other drew their attention to the fact that out of four candidates I was the only

SMETHWICK - AND THAT ELECTION

one to have consistently opposed mass immigration. Conservative election material in Smethwick was honest, straightforward and effective.

The Labour Party made wide use of immigrant canvassers and Left-wing students from Birmingham University were called in to help. An attempt by the Liberal candidate and Labour's local official, John Jackson, to organise large-scale student support was only scotched by the prompt action of the Chairman of the University Conservative Association, Marcus Begby-Clench. He took a tape recording of my answers to the charges from the Left to a student meeting which was, I think, surprised by my moderation.

With the aid of the Left-wing Indian Workers' Association the vote of non-English-speaking immigrants was organised in favour of the Labour candidate. Later, Sandu Singh, Secretary of the non-political Immigrants Welfare Association, claimed that an Indian Workers' Association spokesman told the assembled Indian congregation that the Sikh Temple in Smethwick would be closed down if the Tories won.

The natural sensitivity of the immigrant population on the question of colour was ruthlessly exploited by the Labour Party in the most cynical manner. While adopting publicly a 'holier than thou' attitude they kept hidden the fact that the local Labour Club operated a strict colour-bar. This hypocrisy was widely recognised in Smethwick for what it was, but outside the town the personal status of Mr Gordon Walker ensured its general though temporary acceptance.

Within the constituency it has been estimated that some 4 per cent of Conservative supporters withheld their support from me because of the racist charges. Luckily the popular confidence in the Conservative Party and the strong personal position I had built up by years of local service was sufficiently strong to resist the corrosive effect of these unfounded and vicious attacks.

Since the Election, as the facts have become more clear, many electors who abstained from voting have indicated that their confidence in me has been restored, but even the limited success

of such tactics is a warning that policies aimed at smearing particular candidates with charges of racialism backed with an appeal to coloured voters to support their 'friends' can be effective. They are a lasting temptation to the Labour Party.

Immigration is a legitimate political issue since any matter within the province of local or national Government is a matter of politics. In a democracy political problems become issues between parties. Thus immigration can fairly be a party political issue but the ultimate tragedy would be the exploitation of this emotional issue of colour for party or personal gain. Those of the Right who exploit white prejudice against coloured people, and those of the Left who try to organise coloured people to vote not on the issues but on the basis of their colour, are equally to be deplored.

It is essential that immigrants resist the temptation to become some kind of political pressure group. This can only lead to resentment on the part of their white neighbours. Coloured voters do themselves a disservice if they allow their community to be exploited in this way.

Polling Day in Smethwick was relatively uneventful and Tory workers were confident that when the polls closed success had been achieved. The only cause for concern was the highly organised effort by the immigrant leaders to persuade their local compatriots to vote Labour. The Indian Workers' Association was active in taking Indian men and women to the polls. They claimed that 750 Indians voted as a direct result of this effort. The West Indian Unity Association made a similar but somewhat less concentrated effort. The immigrant leaders were confident that their countrymen had voted overwhelmingly for Mr Gordon Walker.

The *Birmingham Evening Mail*, on Election evening, reported immigrant voters as 'pouring to the polling stations'.

At the counting of the votes Mr Gordon Walker was sunk into the withdrawn gloom which had marked him throughout the campaign. He hardly seemed aware of events taking place around him.

SMETHWICK - AND THAT ELECTION

Even when I shook his hand in greeting he remained closed up in his own thoughts, though a few days earlier we had been in friendly conversation. Long before the final totals were reached it was clear that I had won.

Only Dudley Davies offered the customary congratulation. Mr Gordon Walker was clearly shaken. It was obvious that he had never really believed that he could be defeated.

I was most anxious that the tense situation should be relieved, so I quickly revised my planned declaration speech and, when the result had been announced, confined myself to a formal vote of thanks to the officials and the police. My hopes that this would avoid unpleasantness were not realised.

Mr Gordon Walker's speech was brimful of bitterness and reproach. It was ungracious but I bear him no ill-will. Defeat is hard to accept. I have known it in the past. Mr Gordon Walker had experienced only easy victories at Smethwick. In a democracy defeat is always a possibility. Should it come to me in the future I shall try to meet it with a good grace. Mr Gordon Walker's inability to do that at Smethwick was a contributory factor to his defeat later at Leyton.

No one likes a bad loser but I repeat I bear him no personal ill-will whatsoever. In March 1965 I even invited him to stand again for election in Smethwick. Had he so agreed I would have ensured that he received every courtesy.

While receiving congratulations at the Conservative Club I learned of the uncharitable comments of the Bishop of Southwark. His attack on the electorate was much resented locally. It may be fair comment to attack a politician but to call electors 'un-Christian' if they choose to give support to a candidate not favoured by a particular viewpoint is to abuse the authority conferred by the cloth.

Equally, Tom Driberg's description of the Smethwick electorate as 'illiterate' was received with bitterness by those who had watched hundreds of non-English-speaking immigrants organised into voting against them. No one took much notice of Lord Boothby's comments except those who thought he was a

Conservative spokesman, but Sir Keith Joseph's unhelpful statement was a real disappointment to many of us. These comments, made by people who had no personal knowledge of Smethwick or of its problems, were harmful to the attempts to reduce local feeling.

The widely publicised statement by a group of local clergymen deploring the exploitation of immigrants for political ends could certainly have been better timed. Away from the Election period it would have found general support. In the days following the Election it was regarded as a tactless move by all shades of political opinion. Some misguided people even thought that the statement was an implied criticism of me.

The wise, moderate, conciliatory statements by the Mayor of Smethwick, Alderman C V Williams, on the other hand, were much appreciated and greatly helped to restore the balance. At this point moderation was essential.

Perhaps it would be as well to refer here to the infamous 'leper' statement made by Harold Wilson during the Debate on the Address to the Queen's Speech in November 1964. It is without precedent for a Prime Minister to turn from the task of outlining his government's programme to attack a new Member of the House. It is unique for the Prime Minister to use the protection of the convention that a new Member must await his maiden speech before taking part in debate, to make comments to which personal reply was impossible. The immediate reaction both in the House and outside was to condemn the Prime Minister. His later attempt to claim that his remarks were not intended to be a personal attack on me was quite unacceptable. The Prime Minister's speech indicates the very danger of which I have warned – excessive emotion on this highly charged issue of immigration.

He said, and I quote from *Hansard*: 'If he [Sir Alec Douglas Home] takes what I think is the right course, and what I am sure the country will think is the right course, the Smethwick Conservatives can have the satisfaction of having topped the poll, and of having sent here as their Member one who, until a further General

SMETHWICK — AND THAT ELECTION

Election restores him to oblivion, will serve his time here as a Parliamentary leper.' Perhaps the most charitable explanation is that I had defeated his close friend Patrick Gordon Walker and thus weakened the new Labour Administration from the moment of its birth. In this probably lies the explanation for the vicious, unfair, unparliamentary attack on someone who could not reply. Even the *Spectator*, a periodical not noticeably sympathetic to my policies, said: 'The opening day of the new Parliament was completely overshadowed by one vulgar and venomous phrase from the Prime Minister. The House of Commons guards its traditions jealously, not least that which affords protection to a new Member until he has made a maiden speech. That Mr Wilson, in a carefully scripted part of his own speech, should have used the words "Parliamentary leper" infuriated the whole Conservative Party and dismayed many of his own supporters. However long this Parliament lasts those two words will not be forgotten nor forgiven.'

The bitterness engendered by the 1964 General Election in Smethwick still lingers in some quarters. I have sincerely tried to restore the position to one of reasoned discussion. My maiden speech made on 6th November 1964 sums up my aims and indicates the goodwill I have tried to retain even in such difficult circumstances.

After a brief introduction I said: 'At this moment I feel much in need of the indulgence which this House normally so kindly grants to those who address it for the first time.'

'In Smethwick there are 4,000 families waiting to be rehoused despite the fact that there has been an accelerated housing programme in the town. It is no wonder, then, that in Smethwick the number one social problem is that of housing. One cannot force a quart into a pint pot.'

'Housing and social problems exist in many of our great cities. Those problems in Smethwick have been aggravated over the past few years by the inflow of large numbers of people from overseas, many of whom have social standards different from those of our own people. However I want to make it quite clear

A QUESTION OF COLOUR?

to the House that there is no resentment at all in Smethwick on the grounds of race or colour. I can assure Hon Members that the people in my constituency are as warm and as welcoming towards strangers as are those of any other community in the British Isles. At the same time, I must make it clear that the people of Smethwick are vitally concerned about the length of the wait for housing. They are concerned about overcrowding and insanitary conditions. They are concerned about the pressure of already overlarge classes and, dare I of all Members say this, they are also concerned about questions of health.

'It would be hypocritical of anyone to ignore these problems or to try to pretend that they do not exist. It is essential that all those who seek to represent people or to speak for them should be honest and face up to these problems and discuss them rationally. I make the appeal that they should be discussed without undue emotion. I can assure Hon Members that the local council in Smethwick is courageously and positively facing up to the problems of the town. It is seeking to solve these problems, and I have on every occasion called for the most active co-operation between the members of all races in the town.

'May I crave the indulgence of the House to say that the Smethwick Conservative Party and the electors of Smethwick have shown, I am sure, that they are convinced that the control of immigration is vital to racial harmony. I ask this House to judge the people of Smethwick and their Member on first-hand knowledge of the Member and the town, rather than on second-hand reporting which is often exaggerated. I know of no cause for shame arising from the Smethwick election. There was a democratic choice, a free election. There was every opportunity, with no fewer than four candidates, for full discussion and full expression. The electors of Smethwick made up their minds on all these issues, just as did the electors in every other constituency. They have the right to choose and they exercised that right. No doubt in the not-too-distant future they will have the opportunity to confirm that choice or to make a change. Until then may I respectfully suggest that we in this honourable House address

SMETHWICK - AND THAT ELECTION

ourselves, without personal rancour and without animosity, to the real tasks which face us.'

Was this unreasonable? I believe it expressed the feelings of the people of Smethwick. *The Times* had this to say: 'The House of Commons is a place where personal courage and integrity rank highly, and on this initial test Mr Griffiths emerged with credit.'

The Dilemma of the Future

SINCE October 1964 events have moved rapidly. The tacit agreement on silence about immigration wore thin as the General Election campaign got under way and was entirely exploded by the Smethwick result.

Overnight, immigration became a major talking-point, not only in affected districts but also in areas where no immigrants were resident. In the weeks following the Election I received almost 2,500 letters. Of these, only nineteen were critical – though when these figures were announced a London correspondent wrote another ‘to make it twenty’. This overwhelming support was most gratifying.

Equally encouraging was my reception by my fellow Members of Parliament. Absence of official congratulations on my success had left me in some doubt as to the attitude to be adopted by the Conservative Party towards their ‘stormy petrel’. Wilson’s ‘leper’ remark removed any hesitations and I received every welcome and consideration.

The Parliamentary Labour Party was more circumspect. They did not evince any positive enthusiasm for my presence but there were no really unpleasant incidents. More memorable were two occurrences of a rather surprising nature. The day after Wilson’s comment I was seated in the House of Commons Library. A senior member of the Government approached. After ensuring that we were not being observed or overheard, he clapped me on the shoulder and said: ‘Don’t worry, son. We don’t all feel like that, you know.’

A few days later I chanced to be in a lift at the Commons alone

THE DILEMMA OF THE FUTURE

with an outspoken Labour back-bencher. He was silent at first but then remarked: 'You know Peter, I wish I'd met you five years ago. You could have joined the Labour Party and together we'd have given those smug bastards hell!' His constituency contains many immigrants – perhaps he should have known me five years earlier. He could have joined the Conservatives . . .

At no point did I receive any criticism of my campaign or my politics from Tory leaders though the attitude of Central Office was for some weeks one of studied politeness. Even they, however, came round. In December 1964 a letter addressed 'Dear Alderman Griffiths' was altered to read 'Dear Peter'. It was clearly a case of 'all is forgiven'.

As the weeks passed and party policies drifted to the Right I found myself increasingly regarded as a rather liberal-minded chap by MPs who adopted the new line. Only on one or two odd occasions were remarks directed against me from the Labour benches and each time my colleagues rose to my defence. I much appreciated the assistance of Sir Keith Joseph on the occasion when I was attacked by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health after asking a perfectly innocent question. Sir Keith, admired from a distance by the ladies of my constituency party, had lost favour on Election night, but this incident restored him in their esteem – and mine.

The most intriguing result of Mr Gordon Walker's defeat was the unwillingness of any Labour MP to meet me in debate. Not one of them could be found prepared to face me on a public platform. One can understand the reluctance of the less experienced members; they did not wish to be overwhelmed. The Government Front Bench could claim to be too busy, but what of the heroes of the Left wing? What about the junior Ministers inflated with new-found authority?

The fact is that not one of them would meet me. Whether they were unsure of their policies or of their abilities I cannot tell. Most likely they feared that to oppose me personally would bring about their heads the storm which swept away Labour's Foreign Secretary. This reluctance, more than anything else,

has convinced me that on the Labour Benches there are many who agree with me and many others who are afraid that I am right.

From the moment of my election invitations flowed in thick and fast. In the closing months of 1964 I attended numerous functions and spoke on many occasions to attentive audiences. The big test, however, came on 19th January 1965.

I had been invited to propose a motion at the Cambridge University Union deploring the Labour Party's hypocritical approach to immigration. Here was an audience basically disposed to disagree with me. Opposition was organised on a massive scale. All seemed set for a Roman holiday, but the Labour Party fuked it. No opponent could be found! I commented at the time that perhaps most Labour MPs agreed with the motion! Eventually a rather pompous actor, James Robertson Justice, was called in to oppose me.

Police protection was provided for me and when I entered the Union Building the hostile nature of the audience was apparent. The hall was packed and dozens of anti-Griffiths demonstrators shouted and chanted outside. I didn't really make a speech. I just spoke simply and calmly about the real issues. I talked of the decent, kindly, tolerant, ordinary people of Smethwick. I asked these basically liberal young people to judge me and my policy and my constituents. As I spoke the hissing and the booing died away. The interruptions grew less frequent. The vote showed the motion to be carried by a huge majority of more than two to one. I left the hall to thunderous cheers.

This pattern was to be repeated at dozens of meetings, public and private, up and down the country. Hostility changed to sympathy when the facts were described clearly and carefully. Of course, all the debates were not won, everyone was not converted, but I now know for certain that a large majority of people agree with my views and proposals when they are not misled by smears and unfounded attacks.

Some constituencies have asked me back time and again so that other groups can hear what I have to say. Universities, colleges

THE DILEMMA OF THE FUTURE

and schools have eagerly sought my views. I have never claimed a monopoly of truth or of moral rectitude but I know that today I speak not only for Smethwick but for millions of ordinary decent folk everywhere in this land.

These people are increasingly making themselves heard. For example, I wrote a short letter to the *Bradford Telegraph and Argus*. The editorial policy of that newspaper is liberal and an article attacking me was printed with my letter. In the next few days the ordinary people of Bradford leaped to my defence. Letter after letter poured in supporting my views. Even the resignation of the editor was demanded. All this in a town in which I had never made a public speech. The significance is obvious.

At the same time as I was restoring the balance by my numerous speeches I was approached by quite a number of constituency officers of local Conservative Associations. Many of these felt that with a strong line on immigration they could have done much better at the 1964 Election. All were convinced that a 'Smethwick-type' campaign next time would bring political success. I know that in at least twelve constituencies campaigns will be fought next time which will owe their origins to Smethwick. Some twenty other constituency associations are anticipating taking a strong line, well to the Right of the basic party policy. This should produce a number of new recruits for that section of the Conservative Parliamentary Party which strongly opposes mass immigration.

At the same time several other associations are putting pressure on their liberally inclined Members. They are being forced to listen to local viewpoints and assurances are being demanded. The result should be that in the next Parliament there will be a Conservative Party considerably further to the Right than at present. Such a party would be much more ready to accept the need for really firm legislation.

In the meantime, the work of creating the right climate of opinion goes on. The debates in Parliament are a reliable guide to the way matters are progressing. The whole trend is to the Right but the liberals in all parties are giving ground only grudgingly. Their main weapon is their claim to a higher morality

than their opponents. Some even claim credit for rejecting the popular viewpoints of their constituents.

This attitude was struck a mortal blow at Smethwick but it is taking an unconscionable time in dying. We can therefore expect varying fortunes in the fight to save Britain from the racial perils so clearly seen in other parts of the world. The tragedy is that success may come when it is too late to prevent the creation of a race problem in this country. The leisurely debates of the last few years may have a note of tragic irony when read in the decades to come.

THE RACE-RELATIONS ACT

The issues of immigration and race-relations have been continuously before Parliament since the 1964 General Election. At the beginning of February 1965 the Home Secretary announced that steps were being taken to initiate discussions with the Commonwealth on the subject of immigration. He also told the Commons that the considerable evasion of immigration control was causing concern.

He proposed that in an attempt to reduce the number of illegal entrants – estimated at 10,000 in the previous two years – new regulations would be introduced and new instructions given to immigration officers. He continued: ‘The fresh instructions will require immigration officers, before allowing entry, to subject to the fullest scrutiny, in whatever cases they judge to be necessary, the intention and *bona fides* of Commonwealth citizens seeking entry as visitors or students, as well as the authenticity of their travel documents; and to make a fuller use of their power to impose conditions specifying the period for which a Commonwealth citizen is admitted as a student or visitor.

‘Secondly, there is evidence that evasion is taking place by those who claim to be entitled to enter as dependants under Section 2 of the Commonwealth Immigrants Act, 1962, and immigration officers will examine with greater thoroughness than hitherto has been thought necessary the identity and the validity of the claims of persons who seek entry under Section 2.

THE DILEMMA OF THE FUTURE

'Except where very special grounds exist, I am also reviewing the present practice of allowing as a matter of discretion children under sixteen coming here to join close relatives resident in this country who are not their parents.

'Thirdly, we shall, where practicable, be reinforcing the staffs in posts overseas by assigning to them experienced immigration officers to assist in dealing with applications for entry certificates.

'When persons charged with having evaded the control, or having failed to comply with conditions of entry imposed upon them, are prosecuted and convicted and the court in consequence makes a deportation recommendation, effect will of course be given to such recommendations unless there are very strong reasons for making a special exception.'

Those of us who have been concerned at the number of evasions were very pleased to see this evidence of a shift of ground by the Labour Government. We hoped that the passport racket, whereby one passport issued is sent home by post to be used by a succession of further immigrants, would be eliminated.

Sir Alec Douglas Home followed up this announcement by asking the Home Secretary to consider another suggestion which had originated in Smethwick. He said: 'There is one other proposal which I make which might be worth considering, namely, that he should assist the repatriation of people who wish to go back home, but cannot afford to do so. Will he consider that question, and also keep a very close watch on the total numbers, because it is still my opinion that they will probably have to be curtailed?'

By this time I was able to feel that the Conservative Party was coming to adopt a line of policy which would be welcomed in the areas with numerous immigrants. The improving attitude of the Labour Party was also most acceptable.

However there were strong attempts to halt the flow of the tide in our direction. An unofficial all-party group was set up to 'take immigration out of politics'. The members were mostly young, Left-wing Parliamentarians of both the Labour and Conservative parties. In numbers they were hardly a dozen, but

in a House with a tiny government majority such small groups have a disproportionate influence. There were also many Members on both sides of the House still unaware of the gravity of the situation and who were therefore disinclined to support firm action.

On the 2nd March came a chance to assess the strength of feeling on the immigration issue. Sir Cyril Osborne brought in a Bill to strictly limit immigration. The Conservatives were not 'whipped' so their voting was free. The Government was 'whipped' against the proposed Bill.

Sir Cyril's speech was moderate and reasoned. He said: 'First, I think that we are all agreed that the immigrants who are already in this country are entitled to the full protection of the law, and that anyone who stirs up racial hatred should be punished to the uttermost of the law. Secondly, I believe that all Hon Members on both sides of the House would agree that everything possible should be done to integrate into our society the immigrants who are already here, and to help them to adjust themselves to our way of life. Thirdly, the more immigrants we admit, the greater will be the difficulty of integrating them. The fewer we admit, the easier the problem of absorbing them.'

'My Bill would provide for a definite small quota, greater health checks, a clean criminal record, a working knowledge of the English language, the repatriation of immigrants found guilty of crimes in this country – with the exemption raised from five to fifteen years – the prevention of illegal entrance to the United Kingdom and the provision of assisted passages for immigrants who want to return to their native country. I should like to make it clear that all genuine students and businessmen would be exempted, provided that, when they have finished their training, they go back to their own countries.'

He was answered by Mrs Shirley Williams, Labour MP for Hitchin, whose main point was that further restrictions were unnecessary. She ended an effective speech with an appeal: 'I commend to Hon Members opposite in particular a saying made in a different situation by one of their own distinguished members.

THE DILEMMA OF THE FUTURE

I refer to Edmund Burke, when he said of the American revolutionaries:

‘“Deny them this participation of freedom, and you break that sole bond which originally made, and must still preserve, the unity of the empire.”

‘Today we speak not about an Empire, but about a Commonwealth. But I commend those words to Hon Members on both sides of the House—“deny them . . . participation of freedom . . .”’

Leave to bring in the Bill was refused by 261 votes to 162. Many Conservatives did not vote and a small number supported the opponents of the Bill. Among them were Sir Godfrey Nicholson, Norman St John Stevas, John Hunt and Dame Joan Vickers. This defeat was alarming in its implications. It was apparent that the Conservatives could not take a tough line on immigration without the fear that there would be a minority strongly opposed to the policy.

The Government, however, was continuing to work out its own proposals. On the 9th March 1965 the Prime Minister introduced three new measures: ‘The Government believe that the problems this country is facing in connection with immigration require an attack on three broad fronts.

‘First, it is accepted in all parts of the House that once immigrants are here they should be treated for all purposes as citizens of the United Kingdom, without discrimination. The Government are not satisfied with progress in integrating Commonwealth immigrants into the community, particularly in some of our big towns and cities. This affects a number of Government Departments and I have invited the Under-Secretary of State at the Department of Economic Affairs, the Member for West Bromwich, Mr M Foley, to make himself especially responsible in a personal capacity for co-ordinating Government action in the field and for promoting through the Departments concerned the efforts of the local authorities and of voluntary bodies.

‘Secondly, we all agree that we cannot have first- and second-class citizens in this country. We must therefore take vigorous

measures to prevent racial discrimination. The Government intend to introduce in the very near future a Bill to deal with racial discrimination in public places and with the evil of incitement to racial hatred.

'Thirdly, the House will recall the statement made by the Home Secretary on 4th February about evasion of the Commonwealth Immigrants Act by people coming from certain Commonwealth countries. He then indicated that the degree of evasion of existing controls was almost fatally eroding the Act. This situation arises from the use of false reports, impersonation, false statements about the purpose of travel to this country, and so on.

'Since the Act is not working as was intended, a fresh examination of the whole problem of control is necessary. The Government therefore propose shortly to send a high-level mission, which will include experts in the field of immigration, to consider with certain Commonwealth governments the problems that have arisen. The function of the mission will be to establish the facts, to examine what can be done to stamp out evasion at source, and to discuss whether new methods are needed to regulate the flow of migrants to the United Kingdom.'

This indicated that the pace was quickening and that to some extent the initiative was with the Government. However, there was still no real evidence that the seriousness and urgency of the situation was understood.

The timid approach of the political parties in the House of Commons was well illustrated by the Debate on Immigration on 23rd March 1965. Peter Thorneycroft put over a reasonable but firm approach to the subject. He said: 'I put it fairly and distinctly to the House, so that Hon Members will know where we stand. In our judgement there ought to be a drastic reduction in the inflow of male immigrations, that is, of new workers, that is, through the methods of control and the granting or not granting of vouchers; and of course also in tightening up provisions against evasion. . . . I mean a drastic reduction. It should be a wholly exceptional thing at this stage of this problem to give a voucher to someone coming into this country.'

THE DILEMMA OF THE FUTURE

There followed a procession of Labour and Conservative moderates. No wonder the Liberals were absent! Their viewpoint was expressed for them by one speaker after another. Only Sir Cyril Osborne, with a characteristic contribution, broke away from the back-bench line that immigration was a matter outside politics.

The picture which was given of all immigrants as models of virtue, working at vital points in our economy, is no more accurate than the Fascist contention that they are all disease-ridden layabouts. Lack of real personal experience of the problem was evident.

Most of the Tory speakers represent constituencies with few or no immigrants. Many of them have comfortable majorities. Norman St John Stevas (Chelmsford) sat down to enthusiastic Socialist cries of 'Hear, hear'. Labour stands to lose so much from a firm Conservative policy on immigration that the 'above-party' line is, of course, enthusiastically accepted.

The main fact elicited from the Home Secretary was that there are already one million immigrants here in Britain and another half a million have the right to enter under present regulations. This fact was conveniently ignored by those who could claim that West Indian immigrants were to be welcomed because of their love of cricket!

Not one Birmingham Conservative MP was called upon to speak and although I was present throughout the debate I did not get the opportunity to make a contribution. The *Daily Telegraph* of 24th March said: 'If you have ever seen pussy cats gently padding round on tiptoe you will be able to form an image of the House of Commons debating the formidable problem of immigration.'

This kind of avoidance of the issue does more harm than good and leaves ordinary citizens more than ever convinced that their Members of Parliament are too detached from some problems to understand the urgency with which they are regarded locally.

The debate on the Race Relations Bill on 3rd May 1965 was more valuable. On this occasion the House faced up to the issues

and there was a lively and useful discussion. The Government's case was that the measure was mainly preventative and aimed to provide powers should they be needed in the future. Opposition speakers stressed the natural tolerance and goodwill of the British people. On both sides, there was a feeling that conciliation machinery of some kind was needed.

The Bill makes racial discrimination in a place of public resort illegal. It provides penalties for incitement to racial hatred and makes provision to prevent a landlord declining to transfer a lease to a coloured tenant.

There was broad support for the aims of the Bill from all sides of the House, but Tory speakers generally felt that there was little need for legislation backed by harsh penalties in criminal law and that there was a danger that race-relations would deteriorate because of the introduction of legal proceedings.

Sir Barnet Janner, in a moving speech, expressed the fears of minorities that there might again grow up the kind of mass persecution which occurred in Nazi Germany. My speech expressed a moderate opposition to the Bill and included an appeal for practical measures to help areas affected by immigration. Speaking to a quiet and attentive House I said:

'I speak as one who has always been opposed to all forms of prejudice, but as one who hopes to be called discriminating.

'I oppose the Bill as it stands on several grounds. First, in the present situation it is completely unnecessary. Second, it is unlikely that the Bill will achieve the aims it is designed to fulfil. Third, I fear that it is likely to create tension and ill-feeling which does not exist at present. Fourth, I fear that the real intentions behind the Bill have not been fully ventilated.

'How can the Bill achieve what are said to be its aims? I believe that it will fail. First, it will encourage extremists. I remind the House that extremists are to be found on both sides, not only among the white community. There is the danger that extremist Right-wing elements may even court prosecution because they will welcome the publicity in the newspapers and on television given to the first of the prosecutions coming under the Bill. This

THE DILEMMA OF THE FUTURE

is the kind of publicity on which they batten and in which they glory. In that way we may work against the aims of the Bill.

'Extremists from the immigrant organisations also are likely to take advantage of the Bill. Already in Birmingham, a meeting has been held, well publicised with representatives of the Press present, at which we were told that within twenty-four hours of the Bill becoming law, there would be a mass testing of its provisions. I have always felt that the greatest danger lay in people going round looking for discrimination, seeking out incidents and then, if they found the slightest evidence, magnifying them into cases.

'The basic question is this: is it possible to legislate about people's feeling? It is a problem of people meeting together and learning to live side by side. If such problems exist, there are two ways in which valuable work could be done. The first is by conciliation.

'The step I have most faith in is education. This is the first task and the greatest hope for the future. I do not believe that there is any hope in legislation. There will only be a hardening of attitudes. A series of well-publicised trials will hardly help the brotherhood of man. In fact, we shall merely give a field-day to those who will use the Bill for their own personal or political advantage.'

I believe that I expressed the opinion of the man-in-the-street on this issue.

Winding up for the Opposition, Selwyn Lloyd offered me his congratulations. I was at last able to feel that I was 'getting through' to the House, that suspicion was giving way to attention and that the essentially moderate nature of my views was appreciated.

If immigration can be discussed rationally then a 'national' policy may in time emerge. Then the issue could be removed from party politics. As long as the problems remain unappreciated and unsolved then those of us who are in a position to see clearly just what is the economic and social cost of immigration will continue the fight.

In the Standing Committee which considered the Race Relations Bill much of the real burden of in-fighting fell to Harold Gurden (Selly Oak) and myself. The official leadership was in the hands of Peter Thorneycroft, who made good, moderate, sensible contributions.

All the Opposition amendments were tabled by Mr Gurden and me. We raised a number of objections to the Bill. From the Government side came a major concession to the Conservative viewpoint when the procedure for settling disputes arising from cases of discrimination was changed to allow for civil process through the county courts rather than criminal charges. This concession satisfied many Conservatives, since it had been the core of the amendment moved on Second Reading.

Neither Harold Gurden nor myself was originally selected as a member of the Standing Committee, but after strong representations places were found for us by other Tory members standing down. The details of the Committee discussions need not concern us here but the significant battle was between the Left-wing Labour members who sought to extend the provisions of the Bill more widely – people like Donald Chapman (Northfield), Reginald Freeson (Willesden East) and Ivor Richard (Barons Court) – and the moderates, like the Home Secretary, who wished to strictly limit its application.

On four occasions it was the vote of the Right-wing Conservatives which was needed by the Labour Front Bench to defeat their own Left wing. The strength of the Left-wing feeling is a permanent threat. The danger is that once legislation of this kind is introduced there is a continuous pressure to amend and 'improve' it with all the attendant publicity and damage.

My main objection to the Act is the inclusion of public houses in the list of places of public resort in which discrimination is outlawed. This is not because I favour, or even condone, discrimination in such places, but because I foresee great difficulties in the operation of this proposal.

A licensee is bound to serve his customers within limits and to keep order in his house. If he fails to do this then his licence can

THE DILEMMA OF THE FUTURE

be challenged at the Brewster Sessions held annually for the renewal of licences. An innkeeper must serve *bona fide* travellers and any licensee is responsible for the carrying out of the provisions of the Licensing Act.

Thus, under Common Law and Statute Law the publican has to work to many very strict rules. The nature of his trade makes it likely that he will be faced from time to time with difficult customers. In the past, the landlord could exclude or eject a trouble-maker without offering any reason. It is obviously desirable to avoid an argument with a customer who has been drinking.

Now if the customer is coloured the licensee may well find that a complaint is made to the Local Conciliation Committee that the exclusion was on the grounds of colour. Even if the complaint is not upheld the publicity may be unpleasant.

It would not be too bad if only genuine grievances were raised, but in the Midlands, at least, the Co-ordinating Committee Against Racial Discrimination announced publicly that they would 'test' the Act within twenty-four hours of its becoming law. If people go looking for discrimination it should not be too difficult to find a few isolated cases of poor service which could be developed into major issues.

I spoke on Report Stage and called this part of the Bill an 'agitator's charter'. This is just what it is. The *Daily Mirror* wrote on 9th April 1965: 'Hundreds of volunteers are being recruited in a city [Birmingham] to help in enforcing the Government's Race Relations Bill after it becomes law.

"These "guinea pigs" will be organised by the Co-ordinating Committee Against Racial Discrimination. . . .

' . . . Treasurer Maurice Ludmer said . . . "We can call on about 200 to 300 volunteers who are willing to do this. The Committee . . . has the support of twenty-eight organisations, including immigrants' bodies, political parties, trade unions and university groups. . . ." ' The resultant wrangles and arguments will harm race relations rather than improve them.

The first series of 'tests' took place in Smethwick and West Bromwich early in November 1965. There were no incidents as

landlords had received advance warning. The Right-wing British Rights Association promised to 'meet force with force'. If this provocation continues the results must be disastrous.

The section of the Act dealing with transfer of leases is an example of Labour's 'double-think' on this subject. The Act makes it illegal for a landlord to withhold permission to a lessee to transfer a lease to another person on grounds of colour or race. An exception is made in the case where the landlord has to share facilities, such as bathroom, toilet or kitchen, with the sub-tenant. This exception is reasonable inasmuch as it is in the sharing of facilities that most friction arises between tenants of any race, but why limit it to landlords only? A landlord is entitled to say 'I will not be integrated but my tenants must be'. This is typical of so much Socialist thinking.

All too often the speaker, from a comfortable distance, tells his fellow men that integration is good for them, that immigration is an opportunity for the expression of brotherhood and that they have a duty to perform on behalf of social progress. To my mind they should practise what they preach.

In this particular instance no one would really imagine that race-relations would be improved by insisting on the sharing of culinary and sanitary facilities. It is even worse to insist that only certain sections of the community should be called upon to do so.

I also strongly opposed the section of the Act extending the Public Order Acts. While I fully accept the need to protect Jewish citizens from the unpleasant leaflets which have been circulating, there was no need at all for such wide provisions as those in the Race Relations Act.

No one condones words likely to stir up hatred against any section of the population, but how are speeches to be tested on this point? Are we to have a political police force in plain clothes making notes at perfectly respectable meetings? Who will decide which meetings are to be monitored in this way?

While immigration and race-relations remain legitimate items for political discussion then the Act will be a barrier to free speech. It is another blow to the steadily declining freedom of the

THE DILEMMA OF THE FUTURE

individual. Why should a man not be permitted to mingle with only his friends in the pub? Why should he not decide according to his own lights to whom he will let off accommodation? Why should he not make speeches critical of other races if he believes them to be justified? Apparently the answer is that integration is good for us. Who decided this? Certainly not the electorate – they were never asked their views.

My attitude to the Act brought me a huge, favourable postbag including letters of thanks from the National Consultative Council of the Retail Liquor Trade and the Licensed Victuallers' Central Protection Society of London, bodies representing licensees and publicans up and down the country.

During the summer of 1965 the trend for the parties to move to the Right continued. Selwyn Lloyd made a stirring speech in the Wirral suggesting that immigration should be limited, as far as voucher holders are concerned, to a 'one for one' basis. Under such a scheme a new worker would only be allowed in to replace one returning home.

The speech indicated the lines on which the Conservatives were thinking. It provoked a violent response from Mr St John Stevas who described the proposals as 'inhuman'. This attack led to the highly satisfying sight of Mr Stevas being reprimanded by senior, moderate members of the Tory Party. His isolation on the immigration issue has strengthened the hands of those of us who seek the strictest control.

On 2nd August there came the biggest lurch to the Right. The Lord President of the Council, Mr Herbert Bowden, made a new statement of government policy. He said: 'The Government have decided that there must be a reduction in the rate at which vouchers are issued to enable Commonwealth citizens to come here for employment and, as from today, the rate will be reduced from 20,800 a year to 8,500 a year. Within this figure, however, a temporary allocation of 1,000 vouchers a year, to be reviewed after two years, will be made available for Maltese workers in view of our special obligations to Malta. . . .

'It has further been decided that in future immigrants should

normally be expected to produce evidence of having undergone a medical test in their own countries.

'We shall also seek a wider power in the coming Session to secure that, at the discretion of the immigration authorities, any immigrant, including dependants, may be medically examined at the port of entry.

'The Government have been much impressed by the valuable contribution being made by the voluntary liaison committees in certain areas. The Government hope that similar committees will now be set up in other areas where immigrants have settled, but where no such committees as yet exist. As evidence of our intention to encourage these committees in their work, we shall be prepared in certain circumstances to make a grant available to voluntary liaison committees towards the salary of a trained, full-time, paid official.

'While recognising that local conditions vary, the Government consider that there is also a need for closer co-ordination of effort on a national basis. To this end we propose to establish a new National Committee for Commonwealth Immigrants which will be composed of individuals who are able to bring special knowledge and experience to bear on the problems arising from Commonwealth immigration.' Shades of the Smethwick Election!

The aim of the White Paper in which the Government's proposals were contained was claimed to be two-fold. Control to see that the flow of immigrants is not allowed to get out of hand and measures aimed to ensure that immigrants take 'their rightful place in our society'. The former proposal was positive but the second largely a pious hope. No real action to aid local authorities was promised. We had merely once again vague assurances of some kind of aid, some time in the future.

The reluctance of the Government to take such measures was apparent and since they were clearly unwilling to move more than one step at a time the future problems were not really faced at all. Probably, fear of Left-wing reactions prevented too comprehensive a scheme being put forward. Surely however the Left-wingers, like everyone else, realise that positive aid from central

THE DILEMMA OF THE FUTURE

funds is needed by local authorities. I would have thought that the Left would have been more ready to accept control if there were measures for integration at the same time.

The White Paper was issued just before the summer recess and was not therefore immediately debatable in the House. Outside, the reaction from the Left was predictably violent. At the September conference of the Labour Party this criticism was expressed strongly by a vocal minority.

REACTIONS

There was also criticism of the proposals from Commonwealth countries, particularly the West Indies, though some immigrant bodies in this country expressed cautious approval of the policy.

My immediate reaction was one of satisfaction that some of the proposals I have put forward so often were a little nearer general acceptance. However, on more mature reflection I realised the fundamental weakness of the new Labour policy. The 8,500 new immigrants a year could each bring in their dependants. Thus the total could easily swell to 25,000 or 30,000 a year in addition to the arrival of dependants of those already here. This flood would be hardly less than the present rate of entry.

The second weakness was the failure to realise that a concentration of control on new workers meant that most entrants, being dependants, would proceed to areas already grossly overcrowded. Towns like Smethwick would thus continue to suffer.

There was still no real offer of help to the affected areas. Of the money for extra houses, schools and clinics, for more teachers, health visitors and sanitary inspectors there was no sign.

Finally, the crying need for some scheme for the repatriation of unemployed or unhappy immigrants was once again ignored.

The flow of immigrants gaining entry by unofficial means or by abusing the entry provisions continues. In Pimlico, London, there lives a Pakistani who makes a business of gaining entry permits for his compatriots. He owns two grocers' shops and obtains vouchers by claiming to offer posts of shop-assistant to Pakistanis from home. On arrival they seek a new job and when

they have found it they make a 'present' to their ex-employer who then applies for a voucher for another assistant. This is not illegal but it certainly should be made so because it makes nonsense of control.

A young West Indian woman working in a Hammersmith laundry boasts to fellow workers that she has personally arranged for her six younger brothers to join her in Britain. The fact that she has no young brothers, and that the young men were in some cases older than she, was not found out by the immigration authorities. These false declarations are of course illegal but checks are almost impossible when birth certificates are non-existent. Just as long as abuses continue there will be a need to press for still more effective controls.

The argument put forward in favour of immigration is usually economic. It has for a long time gone unanswered. Those opposed to immigration have pointed to the social problems caused and left it at that. This will not do at all, since it implies that if the immigrants created no social difficulties then immigration would be a good thing. It most certainly would not.

In the first place immigration does not increase productivity. It is true that if the working population can be increased relative to the total population then there could be increased productivity. However if immigrants bring in their families there is no such gain. In fact, since they have larger families than their hosts, they actually reduce the proportion of workers in the total population.

Sheer size of population is of no great economic advantage or China would have the highest standard of living. Efficiency is the real key and an increasing supply of unskilled workers leads either to less efficiency or to unemployment.

Since fewer male workers are now being admitted, any economic advantage which might have been obtained from immigration is lost. Switzerland and Germany have allowed in large numbers of immigrants but they have been workers and relatively few dependants have been admitted. If for social reasons we reject the proposal to allow the entry of men only, then the economic argument for immigration is exploded.

THE DILEMMA OF THE FUTURE

To suggest that certain services could not work without immigrants is ridiculous. Were there no buses or trains before 1948? Were the roads unswept? Was the wool uncombed? The real answer lies in the miserable wages paid in these industries. Pay the bus driver his due and there will be no shortage of recruits. If nursing was a properly paid profession there would be a surplus of applicants. Better pay and more machines to do the dirty, unpleasant jobs would make immigration quite unnecessary. An end to restrictive labour practices in some industries – the docks for example – would set free a supply of workers to make up for any loss through an end to immigration.

We owe no debt to our ex-colonies. The great cities, the schools, hospitals, roads, bridges and airports are the legacy of colonialism. The industries, the bustling commerce and prosperous agriculture, these pay off any debt we might be said to owe. To measure the debt owed compare Ghana with Liberia, Nigeria with Ethiopia, Jamaica with Haiti. The debt owed is one of gratitude to the men and women from this country who brought prosperity to replace poverty, education in place of ignorance, health instead of disease, the Word of God to sweep away superstition and fear. How dare they discount the selfless efforts of missionaries and teachers, engineers and doctors, soldiers and administrators who gave them a heritage and an opportunity. Independence was demanded. Now they have it. We owe them no debt. We too demand independence.

Immigration creates an artificial problem of race-relations. Separate development in independent nations gives every opportunity for co-operation between equals. The interchange of students and trainees and the flow of international tourism give us all the opportunities we need for the exercise of personal participation in the creation of international understanding. We will have happier relations with India, Pakistan and Jamaica if their nationals are not involved in our internal politics. Threats for example to cripple our economy by a strike of immigrant workers are not only incredible but create lasting ill-will.

There are other possible arguments in favour of immigration.

They have been put forward on occasions in the past in other countries. Defence needs may dictate a policy of population growth. Our immigrants today are unlikely to increase our military strength. Their loyalties lie elsewhere. A closed community might welcome immigration to improve the general level of health. No one could suggest that our immigrants are doing this. Skilled persons might be welcomed to diversify the economy. Present immigration is unskilled. A country with undeveloped resources might seek an inflow of new citizens. We are already overcrowded. If immigration increased the happiness of our people it could be justified. It has caused misery to thousands and concern to millions.

Not one of the arguments of those who favour immigration will stand up to close examination. They have appealed to emotion and liberal sentiments rather than to reason. Their ideas must be exposed for what they are – economic fallacy and social stupidity.

At present there is a great rash of books, plays and speeches which give support to the view that the coloured person has to be set free from colonialism, neo-colonialism, segregation and discrimination. There is some truth in this but the lack of outspoken opposition to this viewpoint has led to the public at large accepting highly exaggerated claims.

Popular sympathy has been exploited to further policies which are little understood. The parrot cry of 'colour-bar' has prevented reasoned discussion for far too long. It is time that we saw the problems of race-relations in clear perspective. When we do this we shall realise that continued mass immigration into Britain makes no positive contribution to the solutions and may even reduce the chances of finding answers to the problems.

The creation of a multi-racial society in Britain is likely to set back race-relations in the Commonwealth. Every tiny incident will be magnified out of all proportion. If the Commonwealth fails in understanding then the world outlook is bleak indeed.

Without a coloured minority the British people might be able to retain their traditional tolerance and genius for compromise.

THE DILEMMA OF THE FUTURE

This would be valuable in seeking to help to solve the problems of the Commonwealth countries in the social and economic fields.

Our success would give hope to those other, less fortunate lands, where there seems little hope of a solution at the present. The first task is to stop the rot at home. If race-relations in this country degenerate then we will be able to offer no advice and to give no lead. We must face the facts of our own situation squarely.

Britain's population will approach the seventy million mark by the end of the century. The present overcrowding and pressure on services cannot therefore be expected to be reduced very greatly. We should plan now to avoid the unnecessary tensions which will arise if we persist in the creation of a multi-racial society.

With a growing population of our own, and with automation reducing the demand for labour, there will be no economic justification for continued immigration on any considerable scale. If any immigration of permanent residence is to be permitted it should consist entirely of persons who are capable of being completely assimilated into British society.

In the past, aliens who have come to live permanently in this country have transferred their loyalties to Britain and become naturalised subjects. Permanent residence permits in the future should be limited to self-supporting aliens and others who are prepared and able to become truly British subjects. Clearly this will exclude immigrants from overseas who are not prepared to give up their loyalties to their previous countries. In particular, it will mean the exclusion of those who belong to closed communities of a religious or racial character which would prevent their giving undivided loyalty to this country.

To avoid racial tension the tiny number of permitted immigrants should come if at all possible from the countries of the Old Commonwealth or if not from there from Europe or the United States. This exclusion of people unlikely to be assimilated into our society is not to be thought of as in any way linked with racial prejudice. Throughout this book the essential equality of all

racess has been stressed but since problems of race-relations have proved completely intractable everywhere else in the world, there is no case at all for the artificial creation of such problems here.

The prohibition of coloured immigration for permanent settlement would not affect the flow of students and visitors. This would remain very considerable and would provide the inter-racial contacts which are so valuable. A reduction in the numbers of permanent coloured residents would lower tension and relations would improve. In this improved relationship would lie the seeds of multi-racial harmony.

The numbers of immigrants we have been able to accept over the past two decades has not been sufficient to make a significant contribution to the problems of under-employment in Asia and the Caribbean. However the flow of emigrants from these countries has given their impoverished exchequers a large flow of remittances. To reduce this might have very harmful effects, so I would propose that development aid to these countries be linked directly to the reduced remittances. This would be both fair and equitable and should encourage Commonwealth governments to accept the restrictions with a good grace.

The return of immigrant families, including children educated in this country, would increase the available numbers of literate citizens in their own countries. This is one of the keys to industrial expansion in those underdeveloped countries.

Whatever controls may be imposed on immigration no one imagines a situation in which Britain would be closed to all outsiders like nineteenth-century Tibet. There will always be some flow of people into this country. Those who come for short fixed periods, such as students and trainees and holiday-makers, should be subject only to the normal requirements of the law regarding entry and behaviour. Aliens who wish to live in this country for an indefinite period are already subject to registration and control.

The remainder, those who come to make their homes here permanently, should not be allowed to remain outside the community. National security demands that all permanent residents

THE DILEMMA OF THE FUTURE

in this country shall be either loyal citizens of the Crown or clearly registered aliens. Some form of positive integration of those allowed to become citizens is essential. This will require a massive and expensive effort by the central government.

In the United States there are facilities for teaching the American 'way of life'. Citizenship is restricted to those who have undergone a test of their knowledge of English and the American Constitution. Surely here in Britain the right to vote and to participate in political life in its widest sense should be restricted to permanent residents.

It is ridiculous that non-English-speaking immigrants who have been in the country only a few months, and who do not intend to make permanent homes here, should be able to exercise the privilege of voting at local and national elections. All sorts of abuses can creep in if a large minority of votes can be cast by people who understand nothing of the political problems being decided. In Smethwick at the 1964 General Election Indian immigrants were persuaded to vote Labour after being told blatant untruths by unscrupulous members of their own community. The Indians did in large measure accept the propaganda and cast Labour votes. A survey reported in *Colour and the British Electorate* showed that 'sixteen out of seventeen Indians could name none of the six Party leaders and local candidates'. Is this an informed democracy at work?

It is impossible to know just what biased and inaccurate information is given to an illiterate, non-English-speaking voter. Nor is it possible to know what threats are held out.

The vote should be dependent on naturalisation and this in turn should be open only to those who have shown their ability and proved their willingness to become Britons. In American schools the 'Old Glory' hangs in every classroom, and each morning the children salute the flag and sing the National Anthem. Some positive action of this kind to demonstrate loyalty to Britain might well be introduced into our schools.

Some effort should be made to counteract the flow of propaganda from newspapers and magazines originating both in this

country and in the Commonwealth which encourages an arrogant attitude among immigrants. Some of this propaganda is subtle but much is crude incitement.

The *Jamaican Star* of 11th May 1965 contained the following advice to immigrants: 'They must start to fight for complete integration NOW', and commented about immigrant children: '[they] are entitled to every privilege accorded to their white compatriots'. The same article told the British Government: 'The only way Britain can reduce the flow of immigrants from this country is to give Jamaica the necessary financial assistance that will provide jobs by the thousand at lucrative wages. That, and that only, will make our men and women remain at home.' The kind of attitude engendered by calls to 'fight' and to demand 'every privilege' can only make race-relations more difficult, while the suggestion that Britain must either accept immigrants in large numbers or pay out vast sums is little better than blackmail.

Even worse is the kind of dangerous propaganda poured out by an immigrant weekly called *Magnet*. The first issue stated: 'The coloured population must be given access to the education that they came in search of.' Is 'must' a wise choice of word? Inside, the same issue carried a fictional story about a coloured hero - 'Once, outside a cinema, he had beaten up a man in a Jaguar who had failed to show proper respect for his motor-cycle and, just incidentally, for him.' Is this the kind of example to help racial understanding? I was not surprised to find that the paper made a violent, personal, political attack on me!

This second issue carried a huge photograph of Malcolm X, the American Negro extremist, and said: 'Malcolm X was a militant racialist. He suggested that an American-type Mau Mau was needed in his own country in order to force whites into giving first-class citizenship to the Negroes. Those of us who are familiar with the heartlessness of America's Deep South and the jungles of Harlem may not deny this.' Surely this kind of comment can only fan the flames of incipient race-hatred.

The West Indian Gazette and Afro-Asian Caribbean News is another provocative publication. It condemns imperialism and

THE DILEMMA OF THE FUTURE

praises the various Peoples' Republics. Malcolm X is quoted with approval as calling for violence to meet violence. He is even praised as the 'enemy of racialism'! Britain and, believe it or not, the Soviet Union are described as 'tools of United States aggression'. The influence of such a periodical on semi-literate people can be imagined.

While any form of censorship is abhorrent in this country this freedom must place responsibilities on writers to avoid inflaming racial feeling. Of course there is provocation from racist periodicals produced by white groups and these must be equally condemned, but whereas the white population is sufficiently sophisticated to ignore such dangerous rubbish, the same cannot be said of the semi-literate immigrant. If immigrants are to be persuaded to fight and demand in our country, then racial harmony will be impossible.

An essential during this difficult period is careful reporting of incidents dealing with race-relations. I have been appalled at the amount of publicity given to inflammatory statements made by people who represent only tiny minorities.

There is also the need to avoid the sort of casual mistake which can lead to misunderstanding. An example of this occurred in Northwood, London, in June 1965. Addressing a public meeting in my customary moderate terms, I pointed out to my audience that I had been invited by the sponsors of the meeting to speak on the subject of immigration. 'I do not always speak only about that one topic.' The local newspaper report quoted me as speaking of 'that wog topic'. It was lucky that there were sufficient persons of unimpeachable integrity in the audience to refute the suggestion that I had ever used such a phrase. Otherwise, another inflammatory story might have gone unchallenged. Newspapers have a responsibility to check and re-check what they say on this subject. Even simple phonetic mistakes can be disastrous.

The powerful influences of the radio and television also must be used judiciously. During 1965 a number of programmes dealing with the race situation were heavily criticised for inept handling of this delicate subject. There was a general lack of

balance and an overtone of sensationalism which is much to be deplored.

Everyone has a responsibility when speaking of immigration and race-relations to avoid increasing tension. All too often commentators, writers and speakers appear unaware of the dangers. They should realise that violence is very close below the surface. The bomb outrage at my Smethwick home in October 1965 indicated just how literally 'explosive' this situation has become. Those who use extravagant language bear a great responsibility.

Perhaps one of the greatest contributions would be made if agreement was reached on the exact meaning of such words as 'integration', 'discrimination' and 'coloured'. All too often, words which once had a clear meaning are twisted by political use. Ronald Bell, MP, wrote in *The Times* of the abuse of the word 'discrimination': 'This is discrimination; and discrimination, where it is soundly based, is always right. Must we allow this word, which describes that human faculty which is the instrument of progress, to be degraded into an opprobrious catchword, and used as a rotten tomato in political controversy?

'I try in my own life, to the best of my ability, to treat everyone else fairly and courteously; but I discriminate between all the people I meet upon every ground that I can detect, including sex, age, size, religion, race and colour. Is there really anyone in the world who does not do this? Surely it is only when one attaches a disproportionate consequence to an observed difference that one falls into error.'

If discrimination is now a crime, is a discriminating person a criminal?

Those who speak on the topic of race-relations have a responsibility to speak without ambiguity. If integration means working side by side for the good of the community, then I am in favour of it. If it means miscegenation until you cannot tell a Sikh from a Scotsman, then I am opposed to it – and so are the Sikhs and the Scots. Most people ardently desire peaceful coexistence with those whose ideas are different from their own. Is this not a worthy aim

THE DILEMMA OF THE FUTURE

between races? If coexistence smacks too much of the cold war could we not use the term co-operation? Some agreement among commentators is essential for real understanding.

Our aim should be to have the fullest informed discussion of the facts. Statistics must be made freely available. Knowledge of the real truth often leads to changes of opinion. A correspondent in Wales wrote to me: 'I want to encourage you and also to thank you for your stand. For some time I was hesitant as to where justice lay but now, after a visit to my relations in London, I am convinced.'

EMIGRATION

As the population of these islands increases, emigration of British people helps to accelerate the growth of the coloured proportion. Three factors are at work. Emigration of white Britons, immigration of coloured people from the Commonwealth and a high birth rate among the immigrant community.

The total effect is bound to be far greater than our political leaders appear to realise. When there are four million coloured people in this country they will form a majority in many areas. There are already coloured councillors, so a large community may well expect coloured Members of Parliament.

Making Britain a multi-racial society will involve fundamental changes in our way of life. These changes may well lead to greater numbers of our people emigrating than in the past. Should this happen, then the multi-racial nature of the country would be greatly increased. Some sort of Caribbean or Levantine society would seem curiously misplaced in Northern Europe.

Since 1946 two million of our people have left these shores to seek new homes in Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Many of these are young and vigorous families who take both skill and enterprise with them. We cannot deny them the opportunities of new lives overseas but Britain is clearly the poorer for their going.

The number of Britons leaving to find homes overseas continues to rise. The first half of 1965 showed a 25 per cent increase on

1964 figures. A total of nearly 40,000 Britons settled in Australia alone in the first six months of last year; this was 8,000 more than in the same period of the previous year. The New Zealand Government's target was 3,500 for 1965, but 727 sailed in March alone and thousands more made enquiries.

The reasons given for leaving vary widely. Most seek better opportunities for their children. Some speak of the burden of taxation. The June 1965 issue of *Socialist Standard* quoted a Southall emigrant's application to enter Australia which gave as his reason 'because there are too many niggers in my street'. This is certainly not typical.

For much of the period since 1945 there has been a labour shortage and modernisation of equipment has only in part made up the need. Under conditions of shortage of manpower immigrants have been regarded as necessary. British industry uses a far higher proportion of manual labour to mechanical equipment than her main competitors. There are far too many cases of labour being underemployed because of restrictive practices, or being hoarded by firms which have little use for them at the moment but hope to use them profitably in boom conditions. Increased productivity would raise the profitability of industry and make lower costs and higher wages possible. Such conditions would encourage Britons to stay in this country.

The emigration of mostly skilled or semi-skilled workers coupled with immigration of largely unskilled labour is bound to be disadvantageous to the British economy. The size of the problem is difficult to ascertain, but if we assume that something less than a third of new immigrants are additions to the labour force then we gained some 20,000 in 1964 and at the same time lost some 50,000 male and female workers of considerably higher skill. The exchange is clearly disastrous.

As *The People* suggested, nearly 150,000 Britons were tempted to pack up in 1965. The drain was even worse because most of immigrants at present coming in are women and children.

The exodus of British people does not provide homes and school places for immigrants. The emigrants leave in small

THE DILEMMA OF THE FUTURE

numbers from all parts of Britain but the immigrants concentrate in a few already overcrowded towns and cities.

If some of our immigrants could be persuaded to re-emigrate the situation in the social field would be greatly eased. In this context, the programme of the Government of British Guiana is of considerable interest. Guiana has a population of only 700,000 but an economic potential to absorb 2,500,000. There are some 25,000 Guianese at present in Britain as workers or as students.

The Commissioner for British Guiana has disclosed that his Government hopes to attract them home again. After that it would be possible to accept a flow of immigrants from the West Indies, and, perhaps later, from India and Pakistan. This programme deserves encouragement since not only would it reduce the number of immigrants at present in this country but it would also reduce the flow of new immigrants from the main sources of supply.

Obviously, however, this must be a fairly slow process since immigration into Guiana would have to be linked to economic development and growth. This should be stimulated by the recently announced foreign aid from Britain and other Western countries and also by progress towards independence.

The suggestion by the Afro-Jamaican Association, a Jamaican body, that West Indians should emigrate to Africa is also worthy of consideration. The West Indian Negro came originally from that continent and there are wide opportunities in the under-developed countries of Africa for literate, skilled or semi-skilled workers. If West Indians went to Africa the colour question, of course, would not arise. I discussed these proposals briefly with Mr Norman Manley, Leader of the Opposition in the Jamaican Parliament, during his recent visit to Britain. They are certainly worth perusing.

Probably much more diversion of immigrants from Britain would result if economic aid to Commonwealth countries was related to their policies regarding emigration. There would be greater co-operation from the Commonwealth governments in reducing the flow and controlling illegal exit if the reward for such co-operation was increased financial aid.

Whereas at present Britain has, taking the period since the Second World War as a whole, a net increase in population after emigration and immigration, we should aim at a net decrease.

Restrictions on entry into Britain may not be popular with Commonwealth governments but they can make little real complaint. There never has been freedom of entry from one Commonwealth country to another. Both during colonial rule, and since the granting of independence there have been strict controls over the admission of other Commonwealth citizens into all the territories excepting Britain.

Most Commonwealth countries impose strict conditions to ensure that entrants shall not become charges on public funds. Except for holiday-makers, a visitor is usually required to have a substantial bank deposit in the country concerned or to hold a return ticket home. Would-be immigrants for permanent residence usually need a work permit which will be issued only to those who are assured of employment and, quite frequently, adequate accommodation also. Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago impose very strict restrictions on entrants seeking employment.

The Foreign Nationals and Commonwealth Citizens (Employment) Act 1964 is an example of Jamaican legislation. This Act makes it illegal for any foreigner or Commonwealth citizen to take up employment without a work permit. Anyone doing so, and his employer, is liable to a term of six months in prison. It should be noted that there is no distinction made between aliens and Commonwealth citizens. Work permits must be carried at all times and a permit-holder must submit to having his fingerprints taken if so required.

Clearly then, Jamaica can hardly complain at control of immigration into this country. Despite this, on 5th August 1965 Donald Sangster, acting Prime Minister of Jamaica, announced 'strong representations' to Britain over the cut in the numbers of Commonwealth immigrants. Norman Manley, Leader of the Opposition, has since added his vociferous protests to the others.

Lynden Newland, Jamaican Minister of Labour, led a delegation to Britain in August 1965. After talks with the Government

THE DILEMMA OF THE FUTURE

and visits to many Jamaican communities in this country he said: 'Racial intolerance has ceased to be a domestic affair in any one country. It is the concern of the whole world.

'The country in which the Head of the Commonwealth resides should reflect the highest principles of the multi-racial Commonwealth.' He said:

'The delegation had two purposes in coming here.

'First to consult with the British Government on the causes of the White Paper. Consultation is the lifeblood of the Commonwealth.'

'The second was to meet Jamaican nationals and to impress upon them the need to stand firm in the face of any new evidence of racial discrimination, while avoiding the temptation to answer violence with violence.

'We have found grave concern among coloured persons about the new restrictions. Many are disturbed particularly by the decision to limit the admission of children between the ages of sixteen and eighteen.

'Some left children in Jamaica for reasons of schooling, some for financial reasons. Now their hopes of bringing their families together will be destroyed.

'There was a unanimous feeling that the provisions for registering with the police and for deportation were repugnant to the coloured community. We did not come to inflame them. We came to calm them, since the White Paper had already disturbed them. No disorder on the part of Jamaicans in this country will result from our visit.'

He did not indicate why Jamaica does not live up to the high principles so vehemently enunciated. Nor does he make clear the responsibility of the Jamaican Government to create conditions at home for the hopes of bringing families together to be achieved there.

IMMIGRANTS AND POLITICS

As the number of immigrants grows and as they increase their organisation and confidence we can expect more of them to take

part in politics. Up to now they have been little involved but by October 1964 they were in a position to be reckoned with in a number of constituencies. The concentration of immigrants in certain areas increases their local political strength and in marginal seats this could be decisive.

There are at present no nation-wide immigrant organisations which are capable of taking on a political role. Perhaps the nearest is the Indian Workers' Association which has a considerable membership in the towns where Indian immigrants are concentrated. It is a Left-wing body which has demonstrated not only against racial prejudice but against the Indian Government's imprisonment of extreme Leftist politicians. The IWA draws its support from the industrial workers and its influence on the educated Indian businessmen is negligible. The Indian Workers' Association is basically a welfare body but the political leanings of its leaders has brought it into active politics. In Southall and Smethwick, two of its strongholds, it has taken a direct part in elections, working in support of the Labour Party. In 1964, the President of the Southall Association was reported as saying: 'We are recommending the Labour Party because it is the Party of the working class.'

The work of the IWA during election campaigns has usually been behind the scenes organising the Indian vote. Labour has frequently appeared embarrassed by too outspoken declarations of support. However, Mr Wilson allowed himself to be presented with flowers and promises of support from the IWA just prior to the 1964 Greater London Council Elections.

If other political viewpoints were canvassed with equal assiduousness then the IWA would probably have only marginal influence on election results. At present however, it has a practically clear field and can probably ensure that most Indian votes cast are given to the Labour candidates. As has been pointed out previously their tactics are not always above suspicion and there is some evidence of a reaction among thinking Indians.

The Immigrants Welfare Association formed in Smethwick in 1964 has as its aim the removal of immigrants as a body from the

THE DILEMMA OF THE FUTURE

political arena. It is fundamentally a body concerned with welfare but it is also concerned to break the political monopoly of the Indian Workers' Association. During the 1965 Municipal Elections in Smethwick, Immigrants Welfare Association members canvassed Indian homes refuting the allegations made by the Indian Workers' Association that the Tories were their enemies. This almost certainly resulted in a reduction of the Indian votes for the Labour candidates.

The Pakistani community has no comparable organisation. Pakistanis are linked by their religion and by a number of periodicals none of which appears to be political. The present non-party political set-up in Pakistan itself may account in part for this. Certainly the lack of political tension in Bradford is due in large measure to the wise refusal of the Pakistani community to allow itself to become drawn into British politics.

The West Indians have local standing committees in regions where they are settled in considerable numbers. The names of such bodies vary considerably and they are largely autonomous. Recently there have been proposals for the linking of these bodies into a National Committee. Whether or not such a Committee would take a political line is uncertain.

The West Indian National Association has taken a moderate and constructive line in linking West Indians together. Its activities are mainly social but its responsible attitude has won it considerable respect.

In regions where they are numerous West Indians may form local bodies such as the West Indian Unity Association covering Smethwick and Oldbury. This body is basically social and cultural but it gave political support to the Labour Party in the 1964 General Election.

Generally, West Indians have kept out of party politics in Britain and only a small number have taken an active part. Most of these have supported the Labour Party. Several have become councillors or Party Officers and at least one has been a Labour Parliamentary Candidate.

West Indians find British politics somewhat dull. Even in

Smethwick at the last General Election probably only a comparatively small number of West Indians responded to the call to vote.

A more extreme organisation is the Black Muslim-like Racial Adjustment Action Society which is led by a West Indian friend of the late Malcolm X. This leader, Michael X, is quoted as saying of white people: 'I do not believe in loving the man who is kicking you. All this integration is a joke. What Britain has to do is to integrate itself into the facts of the twentieth century and the particular facts that two-thirds of the world is black. We demand full dignity and if we don't get it, we will take it.' This movement claims several thousand members but this is probably a gross exaggeration.

The lack of political activity among immigrants is a tribute to their good sense. Those who live here should exercise their political rights through British political parties. Separate coloured politics would be to no one's advantage. In participating in British politics the immigrant has an opportunity to express his opinions and influence affairs. If he makes a personal decision to support a party this is a step in the right direction. He should however avoid allowing himself to be used by groups which flatter him by seeking his support while intending to use him for their own ends.

Probably far more useful at the present time than political action would be active participation in welfare work in the towns of residence. This should not be confined to immigrant welfare only but should be work for the benefit of all citizens.

The setting up of bodies for immigrants only is not likely to be helpful. In Smethwick the militant attitude of the Indian Workers' Association and the West Indian Unity Association has led to the founding of a British Rights Association. Responsibility for this polarisation must rest with the immigrants themselves.

More helpful is the setting up of committees in towns where there are many immigrants to co-ordinate social service. Smethwick has such a body with a paid officer in charge. No doubt

THE DILEMMA OF THE FUTURE

such organisations will increase in number and scope. The following districts and towns have already set up liaison committees:

Birmingham	High Wycombe	Nottingham
Bradford	Keighley	Oxford
Derby	Leeds	Slough
Gravesend	Leicester	Smethwick
Halifax	Manchester	Wolverhampton

Similar committees exist in the following London Boroughs:

Brent	Haringey
Camden	Hillingdon
Croydon	Islington
Ealing	Lewisham and Greenwich
Hackney	Southwark
	Westminster

There are regional committees in London, the West Midlands and Yorkshire.

Government aid with the financing of these committees has been foreshadowed but has not yet been made available. The aim should be for people of all races to work as one community. This does not entail giving up their established cultures but it does mean that there should be restraint in the setting up of bodies formed from, or for, the benefit of one racial group. Participation in civic life is true politics. All races can play a part in this. Those who seek to divide, or to perpetuate divisions, do a disservice to the community as a whole.

Of course it is natural for social groups to be formed, which are largely exclusive. Such bodies, clubs or associations, set up to meet genuine needs, must not create conditions in which segregation flourishes. In the social field there should be a gradual drawing together. In the sphere of religion it may take a very long time before there is very easy contact between Asians and the host

community but even here close co-operation should be aimed at.

It is vitally important that extremist views and provocative statements by immigrants should be avoided. Over the past few years there have been signs of increasing truculence among West Indian leaders. The threat of a national strike against the White Paper on immigration control in August 1965 was evidence of this attitude.

Immigrant leaders should realise that militancy is an affront to the hospitality extended by the people of this country. The immigrant will not improve his lot by making demands on his hosts. It will take time and patience for adjustments to be made.

Criticism of the British people and their institutions is an accepted part of our internal politics but criticism from outside is deeply resented. Any talk by immigrants of 'taking over' only encourages white extremists and gives them the opportunity to appear to be correct.

Immigrant leaders should take positive steps to restrain the hotheads in their communities and to remind their people that they are guests in someone else's country. They would strongly object to our interference in the internal affairs of their lands.

The following letter appeared in the *Kent Messenger* of 13th August 1965. It is an example of the kind of attitude to be deplored: 'I am at present in Dover prior to going on holiday on the Continent,' it read. 'Before arriving here I passed through many towns, looking at places of historical interest and trying to find out what made Britain great and what has led to its decline and decay.

'I must say here that I am a Commonwealth immigrant and after watching your people, and talking to them, have arrived at the following conclusions.

'Britain's leaders are the tired sons of a long line of rich men who have lost their empire; the rest of the people are the decaying remnants of a once great nation who will soon lose even the little that is left to them, their national identity.

'We, the new citizens of Britain, will see to that. The old of

THE DILEMMA OF THE FUTURE

your country are too old to do anything, the middle-aged only talk about past glory in world wars, yet I, and people like me, have successfully invaded your country where Hitler failed and these men have not stopped us.

'As for the young men with their long hair and effeminate ways, the less said the better. Never have I ever seen a more unpatriotic people.

'Soon, however, as more and more of my people arrive and the more children we have, we shall take over from your tired leaders and the white man will become a minority race and will do our bidding in the new Afro-Asian state created out of the ashes of Britain.

'Britain is finished; its people are finished. We shall not have to wait long before the predominant colour of skin in this country will be black.

'Excuse, please, for my bluntness.—*A Nebaka, Dover.*'

This is not the first time that such sentiments have been expressed. When this point of view is allowed to go unchallenged by immigrant leaders then their silence is self-condemnation.

The growth of the racial problem in this country has led to the founding of a number of bodies concerned to limit immigration. These should naturally be distinguished from the minor political parties of the extreme Right. Such parties have little support and they make no political progress in areas where the major parties face the problems realistically. However, the warnings of Southall and Islington East should not be disregarded.

The non-political anti-immigration groups are increasing their influence. The Birmingham Immigration Control Association began its activities before the introduction of the 1962 Immigration Act. It has concentrated on influencing the public by statements to the Press and by leaflets. In the Birmingham area it has considerable influence. Its views are moderately expressed and it has generally managed to remain respectable, avoiding the labels of 'Fascist' or 'racialist'. I declined support from the BICA at the 1964 General Election in line with my general policy of fighting on a Conservative platform without outside support.

Since October 1964 two groups have been formed in the Midlands which may prove to be of some importance. Smethwick ex-Conservative Councillor Don Finney, after completing his term of office, set up the British Rights Association. Most of its members previously belonged to the Smethwick Branch of the British Immigration Control Association which was wound up in 1962. Mr Finney has made contact with several groups outside the Midlands and claims that several thousand are included in the total membership. The BRA has taken up the cudgels on behalf of the Marshall Street residents and has been generally active in Smethwick. I was invited to become the Association's first President but I declined since it would have been easy for my political opponents to misrepresent such a position. However I certainly consider that while the Indians have their Indian Workers' Association, and the West Indians their Unity Association, which seek to further the interests of their racial groups, bodies such as the BRA will be needed to keep a balance. I hope that one day there will be no need for any of them.

At the same time as the BRA was formed in Smethwick, the Argus Britons Rights Association was founded in Birmingham. This is a body similar to the BRA but it appears to be rather more extreme and to have an inclination to dabble in politics. Its leader, Tom Jones, was associated with the Birmingham Immigration Control Association. The Argus Association gave support to the Sandwell Youth Club in its colour-bar dispute with the Smethwick Council. It also talks of running candidates for the Municipal Elections in Smethwick.

The Sussex Racial Preservation Society claims to be a 'non-political body dedicated to the Christian solution of the race problem'. The Society bans all extremists from membership. It aims at a complete ban on coloured immigration and the repatriation of all coloured people already here. The main method of seeking support is through a comprehensive questionnaire to which 10,000 replies are being sought.

In a number of areas Residents' Associations have been formed with the specific object of protecting amenities in the districts.

THE DILEMMA OF THE FUTURE

They have sometimes been strongly opposed to immigration. The Southall Residents' Association is perhaps the best known but the London and Counties Tenants' Association and the Cardington Square Residents' Association have also been active in this field. These bodies are highly responsible and have collected much valuable information. For example, the London and Counties Tenants' Association submitted evidence to the Milner-Holland Committee.

Smaller, less publicised Residents' Associations have been formed in London, the Midlands and the North with the aim of avoiding the sale of houses in their areas to coloured tenants. These bodies are finding that the less publicity they receive, the more effective their work can be. Newspaper reports tend to bring about intervention from Left-wing groups and anti-apartheid bodies. In the resulting confusion the united front of the tenants is often broken.

It is to be expected that such groups will grow in number. As they become more numerous federation may well take place. Bodies like the British Rights Association could well play a leading part in this. Of course, there is also an extremist fringe. There has been talk of a British Ku Klux Klan, and other groups have announced racist intentions. Most of these are unimportant. One, the White Vigilantes, which announced its intention of 'moving into the Midlands', proved to have a membership of one! The danger is that such bodies get publicity out of all proportion to their influence and create ill-feeling which takes a long time to eradicate. Their activities are to be deplored. They certainly do not help the cause of limiting immigration because their unpleasant behaviour merely strengthens the hands of the 'let 'em all come' brigade.

The Government has been weakened in its actions towards extremist groups by its unrealistic attitude to coloured people. The white leader of the American Ku Klux Klan was, rightly, banned from entering Britain where he could only have caused trouble. Illogically, except to the Socialist mind, Malcolm X, the Black Muslim leader, was allowed to come into Britain and to

make highly inflammatory speeches and to appear on television.

Extremism does not become respectable merely because it is coloured. Foreign agitators of any colour should be kept out of Britain during the present time, while race-relations are on a knife edge. There is no room for them here – black or white.

The Government should also keep a wary eye on extremists at home. The Race Relations Act might be justified if it was used to prevent all incitement. Until there is a change in policy towards immigration and the problem is taken in hand, there will be a need for permanent vigilance to avoid incidents. Once the number of immigrants begins to fall the likelihood of violence will recede.

REPATRIATION

Many immigrants who came to this country are disappointed with life here. Some are unemployed, some are homesick. Return home for the successful may be possible but the failures cannot possibly raise the cost of fares home. Travel to Britain may well be financed by travel agencies, but no one will finance the return of an unhappy, penniless migrant.

It would be to our national advantage to introduce a repatriation scheme for those who have not worked for a length of time. The unemployed immigrant still makes full demands on the social services for his family. The cost of repatriation would be much less than the National Insurance and National Assistance Board payments over a long period. The unemployed Commonwealth citizen should be the responsibility of the Government of his own country and not of the taxpayers of Britain. Immigrants come here to seek their own advantage and should be allowed to remain only so long as they are no burden on the social services. Repatriation should be voluntary but National Assistance payments should not be made to an immigrant who refuses to take advantage of the scheme.

Of course during short-term unemployment or sickness the immigrant should be treated as generously as anyone else. After

THE DILEMMA OF THE FUTURE

making National Insurance payments, benefit is his right, but only for a limited period.

If single immigrants and families were repatriated under this scheme then successful immigrants who could provide proper homes would be able to bring in their families to join them under a 'one-for-one' scheme. Over a period of time all families would be united, either here or at home. Then, when an immigrant family left Britain, there would be a reduction in the total number of immigrants here.

Of course, many immigrants who would like to return home can raise the fares for themselves and their families. These people would not abuse the free repatriation service. They would have no wish to remain in this country without employment during the qualifying period because this would reduce their savings by more than the cost of the fares. If provision were made for partly assisted passages many more immigrants would take advantage of the opportunity. Acceptance would be dependent on the signing of an agreement not to return.

It is difficult to know just how many immigrants would avail themselves of provision for repatriation. Surely those who did so would be the least successful economically and socially in this country. They would be those who are making least contribution to our economy and those least able to adapt to our way of living. Such proposals would therefore not weaken our economy but would improve our social cohesion.

The present position is that there is an entry of some 60,000 a year, three-quarters of whom are dependants who make social demands but no economic contribution. Suddenly, in less than two decades, Britain has become a multi-racial society. The joint secretary of the Council for Racial Harmony, in Wolverhampton, said in April 1965: 'It is true that, at present, the immigrants are concentrated in certain parts of Wolverhampton. I agree that, if this continues, I can foresee a time, say in twenty-five years, when coloured people in these areas will outnumber the white population.'

Whatever we do in the future this situation exists today. The

immediate, complete banning of all immigration would not avoid our having to face this. We and our children will have to meet these problems and try to solve them.

Basically, the answer must be the gradual repatriation of immigrants and a slowing down of emigration. Our aim for the future must be the development of a British society.

OVERSEAS AID

Unless we are to shrug off our responsibilities to the Commonwealth entirely, it is essential that any restriction of immigration should be accompanied by substantial financial and technical aid to the less developed territories. Already our overseas economic aid is very substantial but it could be greatly increased.

Tables V and VI show the amounts of aid given in 1963-4.

TABLE V. AID TO COMMONWEALTH COUNTRIES

	Total Aid	Aid per head of the Population
	£	£
Cyprus	1,797,000	3.1
Malta	6,278,000	19.1
Ghana	927,000	0.1
Nigeria	1,450,000	0.03
Sierra Leone	2,649,000	1.2
Kenya	15,293,000	1.7
Tanganyika	7,393,000	0.7
Uganda	5,499,000	0.8
Nyasaland	8,884,000	2.2
Northern Rhodesia	4,278,000	1.2
Jamaica	889,000	5.3
Trinidad and Tobago	1,955,000	2.1
Ceylon	684,000	0.1
India	26,604,000	0.1
Pakistan	9,049,000	0.1
Maldiv Islands	51,000	0.5
Malaya	489,000	0.1
Sabah	639,000	1.3
Sarawak	752,000	0.9
Singapore	237,000	0.1

THE DILEMMA OF THE FUTURE

TABLE VI. AID TO COMMONWEALTH DEPENDENCIES

	Total Aid	Aid per head of the Population
	£	£
Gibraltar	11,000	0.5
Aden	5,308,000	4.4
Gambia	1,384,000	4.4
Basutoland	1,900,000	2.6
Bechuanaland	2,129,000	4.2
Swaziland	1,574,000	5.6
Southern Rhodesia	3,876,000	1.0
Mauritius	1,545,000	2.1
St Helena and Ascension	181,000	36.2
Seychelles	258,000	5.7
Tristan da Cunha	7,000	23.3
Antigua	190,000	3.3
Bahamas	495,000	4.1
Barbados	94,000	0.4
Cayman Islands	23,000	2.6
Dominica	583,000	9.3
Falkland Islands	13,000	6.5
Grenada	520,000	5.7
British Honduras	1,058,000	10.6
British Guiana	1,586,000	2.6
Montserrat	246,000	18.9
St Kitts-Nevis	245,000	4.0
St Lucia	450,000	4.7
St Vincent	432,000	5.1
Turks and Caicos Islands	140,000	23.3
Virgin Islands	186,000	23.3
Brunei	1,000	0.01
Hong Kong	330,000	0.1
Fiji	1,475,000	3.4
Gilbert and Ellice Islands	105,000	2.1
New Hebrides	129,000	2.0
Solomon Islands	911,000	6.9

These figures show that we have not been lacking in generosity. When we see that every single Jamaican received the equivalent of over £5 from this country and that aid to Malta totalled over £19 a head in one year, there is every cause for pride in our efforts to help others.

If we did not have to meet the heavy cost of immigration we could be more generous and the aid could go to provide permanent jobs for citizens of the Commonwealth. The increased

economic prosperity of these countries would be of immediate benefit to our export industries.

Economic aid should be stepped up to the developing countries of the Commonwealth which agree to accept immigrants from over-populated areas, and to those countries which lose revenue because of restriction on the entry of their citizens into this country. Financial assistance should be given as a part of our social policy of reducing the number of immigrants in Britain. We should help to provide them with jobs at home or elsewhere.

The British people are traditionally generous to the less fortunate. An end to immigration would create the conditions in which this generosity could be demonstrated as never before.

Conclusion

I OPENED the Preface of this book with the words 'Britain has a racial problem'. The former Home Secretary, Sir Frank Soskice, said of our society: 'We are multi-racial now. There are between 800,000 and one million coloured immigrants in this country, and we must try to behave as civilised people and live happily together in a prosperous and well-ordered community.' On this there can be no difference of opinion. It is on the Britain of tomorrow that we differ fundamentally.

More controversial is the statement of Richard Marsh, Joint Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Labour, speaking to a Young Socialist meeting in London. 'We have to accept that Britain is already a multi-racial society,' he said. 'From now on our schools will turn out an ever-increasing number of black, brown and coffee-coloured teenagers who are not immigrants, but coloured English men and women who know no other country.' This is just not true. It is dangerous nonsense. 'These youngsters will be young Jamaicans, Indians and Pakistanis. They will be proud of their race and country.'

Most politicians still appear willing to let matters drift. Fiddling around with quotas of entrants and vague platitudes on integration are their total contributions. I believe that the electorate will reject this *laissez-faire* policy as decisively as they rejected the 'let 'em all come' ideas which prevailed until 1962. On the 26th August 1965 the *Daily Mail* said that a previous article on integration 'produced a flood of letters more than 80 per cent of which opposed integration'.

We must deplore a situation in which politicians ignore the

problems of our society. Equally we must eschew any counter-bidding of illiberality, with political opponents seeking electoral favour by seeing who can be 'toughest' towards the immigrants.

Our need is for a national policy, broadly conceived and non-political in its execution. As one who has been proved by events to have been right in 1959 and in 1964, and as one who has never deviated from the first expression of tolerance with firmness, I respectfully commend my views to the people of Britain.

First, we must accept that our destiny lies in our own hands. The success of our own efforts will make us great. The failure of our people to meet the challenges of the age would condemn us to a place in the backwaters of the nations. No dwelling on past glories, no resting on the laurels of past victories will carry us through. Only effort, energy, initiative, enterprise and, above all, unity will earn us a place at the table of the great nations in the years to come.

If we are to expect this effort from our people, and past calls to arms have never found us wanting, then we must hold out, as the ultimate goal, a Britain, finer, better, more rewarding than ever before. This will hardly be achieved if we create a cosmopolitan state instead of a British society.

Secondly, we must understand the nature of our obligation to mankind as a whole. It should be our duty, our joy and our glory to help the poor, the sick, the ignorant and the needy of every land. We will not do this by throwing open our gates to any who wish to come here but by the generous flow of help and assistance from these islands to less fortunate lands overseas.

Third, in our zeal for democracy and in the recognition of the fundamental worth of each individual we must recognise the right to be different. Within our own nation there are divisions of opinion, of taste, of ability and of appearance. These differences are the very stuff of humanity and they are one of the conclusive arguments for the recognition of the essential equality of all men.

Between nations, these differences are still greater. Between races they may be fundamental. We should not seek to impose

CONCLUSION

our way of life, our code of behaviour or our structure of civilisation on other peoples. Mankind should be allowed to grow in the full richness of diversity. Every race must be permitted to develop, in full freedom, the peculiar contribution to humanity which it is best fitted to make. This is not to lead to the division of mankind but to the creation of harmony. There is room in this world for many different forms of society even though none can be entirely independent.

The fourth basic premise is that communities should develop their links one with another. Bonds of friendship can be forged in so many ways – through economic ties, through travel and through art and literature. No country loses independence through these forms of communication. These doors should be flung open!

Fifth, we must offer the greatest, most sympathetic support to those who for historical reasons cannot claim the exclusive use of a homeland. These multi-racial societies will have greater need for tolerance and perseverance than any others. Their citizens will have to learn, perhaps slowly and painfully, the need to allow their minorities equality of status and the right to develop separately.

Finally, we must stamp out those forces which seek to divide men by denying to any the right of self-determination. Those who would impose a political philosophy, a religious creed or an economic system are all equally to be condemned. Those who preach the superiority of any religious, political, racial or ethnic group are the real enemies of the progress of mankind.

These principles are surely a basis for discussion between men, between nations and between races. We should seek to apply them first of all in our own land.

Bibliography

International Race-Relations and Immigration to the United Kingdom

- | | |
|---|-------------------------|
| <i>Common Sense About Race</i>
Camelot Press | P Mason |
| <i>The Economics of International Migration</i>
Macmillan & Co | B Thomas |
| <i>Migration and Economic Growth</i>
National Institution for Economic and Social Research | B Thomas |
| <i>White and Coloured</i>
Alden & Co | M Banton |
| <i>Colour Bar</i>
Stanley Paul & Co | L Constantine |
| <i>White Man</i>
Institute of Race Relations | G Jahoda |
| <i>Coloured Minorities in Britain</i>
Lutterworth Press | S Collins |
| <i>European Voluntary Workers in Britain</i>
Manchester University Press | J A Tannahill |
| <i>Disappointed Guests</i>
Institute of Race Relations | H Tajfel and J L Dawson |
| <i>They Seek a Living</i>
Hutchinson & Co | J Eggington |
| <i>The Immigration Problem</i>
H W Wilson | C A Peters |
| <i>The Absorption of Immigrants</i>
International Library of Social Reconstruction | S N Eisenstadt |

- Stride Towards Freedom* M L King
Victor Gollancz Ltd
- Newcomers* R Glass
Centre for Urban Studies
- Colour and Community* W H Israel
Slough Council of Social Service
- The Unarmed Invasion* Lord Elton
Geoffrey Bles Ltd
- The Coloured Quarter* M Banton
Jonathan Cape Ltd
- Immigration: What is the Answer?* C Pannell and F Brockway
Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd
- Colour Prejudice in Britain* A H Richmond
Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd
- A History of the Jews in England* C Roth
Clarendon Press
- Indian Immigrants in Britain* R Desai
Institute of Race Relations
- The West Indian Comes to Britain* S K Ruck
Family Welfare Association
- Immigration and Race in British Politics* P Foot
Penguin Books Ltd
- Colour and The British Electorate 1964* N Deakin
Institute of Race Relations
- Race-Relations in the United States of America**
- A Grammar of American Politics* W E Binkley and M C Moos
Alfred A Knopf Ltd
- The American Constitution* Kelley
W W Norton & Co
- American Constitutional Development* C B Swisher
Houghton Mifflin Company
- Open Occupancy v Forced Housing* A Avins
Bookmailer
- Ten Years of Prelude* B Muse
Darwen Finlayson Ltd

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------|
| <i>The Ku Klux Klan</i> | W P Randell |
| Trinity Press | |
| <i>Jim Crow Guide to the USA</i> | S Kennedy |
| Lawrence & Wishart Ltd | |
| <i>Notes of a Native Son</i> | J Baldwin |
| Michael Joseph Ltd | |
| <i>The Fire Next Time</i> | J Baldwin |
| Michael Joseph Ltd | |
| <i>Nobody Knows My Name</i> | J Baldwin |
| Michael Joseph Ltd | |
| <i>Immigration and the USA</i> | P Tyler |
| H W Wilson | |

Race-Relations in South Africa

(This list is somewhat unbalanced due to the marked lack of books sympathetic to the South African case published in Britain)

- | | |
|--|-------------------------|
| <i>Handbook on Race Relations</i> | E Hellmann |
| Oxford University Press | |
| <i>The Republic of South Africa</i> | Lord Hailey |
| Oxford University Press | |
| <i>A History of South Africa</i> | C De Kiewiet |
| Oxford University Press | |
| <i>An Historical Geography of South Africa</i> | N C Pollock and S Agnew |
| Longmans Green & Co | |
| <i>South Africa</i> | H M Robertson |
| Com Studies Centre | |
| <i>A History of Southern Africa</i> | E Walker |
| Longmans Green & Co | |
| <i>South Africa, Crisis for the West</i> | C and L Lejum |
| Pall Mall Press Ltd | |
| <i>Background to Bitterness</i> | H Gibbs |
| Frederick Muller Ltd | |
| <i>The Anatomy of South African Misery</i> | C De Kiewiet |
| Oxford University Press | |
| <i>The Road Ahead</i> | H Spottiswoode |
| Bailey Bros & Swinfen Ltd | |

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- | | |
|---|-------------------------|
| <i>Whither the Transkei?</i> | W A Bellwood |
| Bailey Bros & Swinfen Ltd | |
| <i>Naught For Your Comfort</i> | T Huddleston |
| Wm Collins Sons | |
| <i>You Are Wrong, Father Huddleston</i> | A Steward |
| Bodley Head Ltd | |
|
<i>Race-Relations in Rhodesia</i> | |
| <i>The Story of the Rhodesias and Nyasaland</i> | H J Hanna |
| Faber & Faber Ltd | |
| <i>A History of Northern Rhodesia</i> | L H Gann |
| Chatto & Windus Ltd | |
| <i>Racial Themes in Southern Rhodesia</i> | C A Rogers and C Frantz |
| Yale University Press | |
| <i>The Vision Splendid</i> | C Lucas Phillips |
| Heinemann Publishers Ltd | |
| <i>The Anatomy of a Partnership</i> | T R M Creighton |
| Faber & Faber Ltd | |
| <i>The Birth of a Plural Society</i> | G H Gann |
| Manchester University Press | |
| <i>The Birth of a Dilemma</i> | P Mason |
| Oxford University Press | |
| <i>Year of Decision</i> | P Mason |
| Institute of Race Relations | |
| <i>Central African Emergency</i> | C Sanger |
| Heinemann Publishers Ltd | |
| <i>European Politics in Southern Rhodesia</i> | C Leys |
| Clarendon Press | |
| <i>Four Thousand Days</i> | R Welensky |
| Wm Collins Sons | |

Index

- ABSE, Leo, MP, 104
 Advertising, misleading, 108
 African Nationalists, 72, 74-5
 Agriculture, immigrants in, 105, 109-10
 Air stewardesses, immigrants as, 106
 Aliens Act (1793), 27
American Dilemma, An (Myrdal), 45
Anthropology (Kroeber), 19
 Anti-Semitism, 13, 25, 27, 29
 Apartheid, 19, 55, 60-4, 152
 Arabs, 36, 95
 Argus Britons Rights Association, 218
 Australia, Aborigines, 15, 23
 emigration to, 207-8
 Austria, 16
- BAKER, A, 64
 Baldwin, James, 46, 49
 Balts, 29
 Bantu, 56, 58-67
 Batley, 134
 Bedford, 30
 Begby-Clench, Marcus, 173
 Belgium, 24
 Bell, Ronald, MP, 206
 Benn, Anthony Wedgwood, 152
 Birmingham, West Indians in, 34
 Indians in, 35
 distribution in, 37
 moral standards flouted in, 88, 97
 drug trafficking, 96
 crimes of violence, 98
 employment, 104, 105
 housing, 118, 124
 education, 133, 134, 138
 health, 144, 145
 birth rates, 148, 149
- Immigration Control Association,
 155, 217
 University, in 1964 Election, 173
 test cases of Race-Relations Act in,
 191, 193
 Argus Britons Rights Association
 founded in, 218
Birmingham Evening Mail, 99, 150, 172,
 174
Birmingham Post, 167
 Birth rates, 147-8
Black and White in the Southern States
 (Evans), 53
 Blackburn, 110, 118, 134
 Black Muslims, 46, 49, 50, 53
 Boers, 58
 Bolton, 145
 Bomb outrage, on author's home, 206
 Boothby, Lord, 175-6
 Bottomley, Arthur, MP, 153
 Bowden, Herbert, MP, 195
 Boyle, Sir Edward, MP, 164
 Bradford, Indians in, 35, 86
 'ghettos' in, 87, 124
 Pakistanis in, 95, 120, 213
 education, 133
 health, 145, 146, 150
Bradford Telegraph and Argus, 183
 Brazil, 15, 25
 Briant, Dr J, 144
 Bristol, 34, 35
 British Guiana, 23, 209
 British Immigration Control Associa-
 tion, 218
British Medical Journal, 146
 British race, components of, 26-7
 British Rights Association, 194, 214,
 218, 219

British South Africa Company, 70
 Brockway, Lord, 153
 Brothels, 96
 Building sites, immigrants work on, 104
 Burma, 23
 Butler, R A (Lord Butler), 156

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY UNION DEBATE, 182

Canada, emigration to, 207
 Cardington Square Residents' Association, 219
 Cars, purchase of, by immigrants, 111
 Castle, Barbara, Mrs, MP, 153
 Catering, immigrants in, 105
 Census (1961), 34, 37, 39
 Ceylon, 23, 83
 Chapman, Donald, MP, 192
 Chertsey, 145
 Chicago, 46, 55
 Children, immigrant, *see* Education
 China, Red, 16, 84
 racial prejudice in, 81-2
 Chinese immigrants, 30-1
 Christianity, 12-13
 Civil Rights Movement, 46, 51-2
 Colonial rule, 23-5
Colour and Community, 118
Colour and the British Electorate, 159, 203
 'Colour bar', parrot cry of, 200
Coloured Immigrants in Britain, 147
Coloured Like You (film), 46
 Committee on Racial Equality, 46, 48
Commonsense about Race (Mason), 14
 Commonwealth Dependencies, Aid to, 223
 Commonwealth Immigrants Act (1962), 37, 155-8, 163, 184
Commonwealth Immigrants in Britain (Davison), 142
 Competition in employment, 110
 Concubinage, 93
Conflict in Colour (Weale), 62
 Congo, 24, 68, 83
 Connecticut, 47
 Conservative Party, and housing, 116, 121, 126
 and immigration control, 153-9, 183, 186-7, 195
 and 1964 Election, 161-77, 180-1, 183
 as Opposition in Smethwick, 162-3

 and repatriation, 185
 and Debate on Immigration (March 1965), 188-9
 and Race-Relations Bill, 189-92
 Contact with immigrants, avoidance of, 89
 Co-ordinating Committee Against Racial Discrimination, 116, 193
 Co-ordinating Committees, 214-15
 Council of Chiefs, Domboshawa, 74-5
 Council for Racial Harmony, 221
 Coventry, 35
 Crime, 95-102, 169, 186
 Cromwell, Oliver, 27
 Crosland, Anthony, MP, 136
 Crossman, Richard, MP, 122-3
 Cultures, 22, 126, 131
 Cypriots, 30, 105

DAILY MAIL, 225
Daily Mirror, 193
Daily Telegraph, 189
Dark Million, The, 41
 Davies, Dudley, 170-1, 175
 Davison, R B, 142
 Deportation laws, 98
 Desai, Rashmi, 35, 87, 94
Detroit News, 54
 Dewsbury, 134
 'Discrimination', misuse of word, 206
 Disraeli, Benjamin, 27
 Dockers, immigrants and, 104
 Dodd, E J, 98
 Douglas-Home, Sir Alec, MP, 168, 176, 185
 Driberg, Tom, MP, 175
 Drapery trade, Indians, in, 111
 Drug trafficking, 95, 96-7
 Dudley, 145
 Dutch East India Company, 50, 58

ECONOMIC ADVANTAGES OF IMMIGRATION, fallacy of, 198-9, 201

Education, 108, 128-43
 special problems, 128-31
 English, teaching of, 130-1, 133, 170
 cultural difficulties, 131-2
 'eleven-plus', 132
 non-English classes, 132, 134, 139

INDEX

immigrant teachers, 135-9
 cost, 137-8
 radio and television as aids to, 141
 Edward I, King, 26
 Edward III, King, 26
 Election, General (1964), 9, 159, 161,
 165-79
 policy statement, 168-70
 Polling Day, 174-5
 aftermath, 175-9, 180-1
 Elton, Lord, 100
 Emigration, 207-11
 Employment, 103-10. *See also specific
 fields*
 English, teaching of, *see* Education
 Ennals, David, MP, 153
 Evans, Maurice, 53
 Ex-colonies, our debt to, 198
 Extremism, dangers of, 190-1, 220

FAMILY UNIT, 90-5

Fiji, 23
 Finney, Don, 122, 125, 218
Fire Next Time, The (Baldwin), 49
 Fletcher, Eric, MP, 158
 Foley, M, MP, 187
 Foot, Sir Dingle, MP, 153
 Foot, Michael, MP, 153
 Foot, Paul, 172
 Ford, Gerald, 46
 Foster, Jack, 172
 Freeson, Reginald, MP, 192

GAITSKELL, HUGH, 153, 156, 157

Genetic diversity, 17-18
 Germany, West, immigration in, 77-9,
 109, 198
 Ghana, 83, 199, 222
 'Ghettos', 87, 120, 121, 128
 Golding, Dr, 63
 Goods, purchasing of, 86, 94, 110-12
 Gould, Councillor E, 116
 Greenwood, Anthony, MP, 153
 Greet, Dr K, 147
 Groves, Mrs A, 121
Guardian, The, 167
 Gurden, Harold, MP, 163, 192

HAITI, 22, 199

Harlem, 46, 50, 53

Health, 143-5, 169

entry checks, 143-7, 150-1, 186, 196
see also specific diseases
 Health Service, 108. *See also* Health
 Hindus, 14, 34, 91
 Holland, immigration in, 79-80
 Hottentots, 58, 59
 Houses, housing, 108-9, 112-27, 178
 purchase of, by immigrants, 86, 114,
 119, 124-5
 shortage, 112
 estate agents, 113, 120
 overcrowding, 113, 115, 116-17, 201
 municipal estates, 116
 flats for immigrants, 117
 cleanliness in, 126
 multi-racial committees, 126-7
see also Landlords and Smethwick,
 Marshall Street
 Howell, Denis, MP, 158
 Huddleston, Father Trevor, 27, 64, 67
 Hugill, David, 170
 Huguenots, 26-7
 Hungarians, 30
 Hunt, John, MP, 187

ILKLEY, 145

Illegal entry, 36-7, 197-8
 Illegitimacy, 147
 Immigrants Welfare Association, 173,
 212-13
 Immigration, early, 26-9
 during and after World War II, 29-31
 coloured, 31-6
 changing pattern of, 36
 distribution of, 34, 37
 growth of, 37-41, 85
 statistical tables, 38-40
 social cost of, 108
 and absorption into community, 117
 control of, 153-7, 160-1, 166, 169,
 184 ff, 195-7, 202
 Debate on (March 1965), 188-9
 arguments put forward in favour of,
 198-200
 re-emigration, 209
 political activities of immigrants,
 211-17
 heavy economic cost of, 223
 and *passim*

- Immigration and Race in British Politics*
(Foot), 172
- Income Tax, concessions in, 99-100
- Indian Immigrants in Britain* (Desai), 35, 87, 94
- Indians, emigrations of, to various countries, 23
- growth of immigration of, to Britain, 32-3, 38, 39
- varieties of, 34-5
- religions, 34, 91, 106, 215
- distribution of, 35-6, 86
- numbers, 38-40
- settling in, 86-7
- as landlords, 86, 114, 117-19, 125
- formation of groups, 91-2
- resented for strangeness and withdrawal, 95
- abuse of Assistance by, 99
- employment, 103 ff
- women, position of, 110
- in drapery trade, 111
- cleanliness of, in houses, 126
- children, at school, 131 ff
- teachers, 135-9
- misled by propaganda, 203
- political activities of, 212-13
- Indian Workers' Association, 116, 122, 132, 164-5, 173, 174, 212-14, 218
- Industry, employment in, 104, 110
- Institute of Race Relations, 147
- Irish, 27-8, 41, 96
- Israel, 29
- Italians, 30, 105, 134
- JACKSON, John, 173
- Jamaica, immigration into, 210-12
- aid to, 223
- Janner, Sir Barnet, MP, 190
- Jews, 21, 26-7, 28-9, 194. *See also* Anti-Semitism
- Johnson, President Lyndon B, 48
- Jones, Aubrey, 145
- Jones, Tom, 218
- Jordan, Colin, 171
- Joseph, Sir Keith, MP, 176, 181
- Justice, James Robertson, 182
- KENNEDY, PRESIDENT JOHN F, 48, 54
- Kent Messenger, 216
- Kenya, 23, 24
- King, Dr Martin Luther, 48, 51, 120, 124
- Knives, carrying of, 97
- Komsomolskaya Pravda*, 82
- Ku Klux Klan, 43, 50, 219
- LABOUR PARTY, and housing, 122-3
- oppose specialist English teaching, 132
- membership of anti-apartheid bodies in, 152-3
- and immigration control, 153-9, 186-7, 196
- and 1964 Election, 161-77, 181-2
- change of attitude in, 185, 195
- and Immigration Debate (March 1965), 188-9
- and Race-Relations Bill, 189-92
- and White Paper (1965), 196-7
- weakness of new policy, 197
- Lambeth, 124
- Landlords, coloured, 114-15, 117-19.
- See also* Houses
- Laubsher, Professor, 67
- Leases, transfer of, 194
- Lee, Jennie, Mrs, MP, 153
- Leeds, 34, 35
- Leicester, 149
- 'Leper' statement, 176-7
- Leprosy, 150
- Leyton, 175
- Liberals, 161
- Lincoln, Abraham, 66
- 'Little Harlems', 120, 124, 125
- Little Rock, Arkansas, 54
- Liuzzo, Mrs, 50
- Liverpool, 35, 114
- Lloyd, Selwyn, MP, 191, 195
- London, 34, 35, 37, 104, 113, 124, 133, 143, 205
- County Council, 134
- University, 36
- London and Counties Tenants' Association, 219
- London Transport, 103-4
- Los Angeles, 46, 52-3
- Louisiana, 48
- Lowestoft, 143
- Ludmer, Maurice, 193

INDEX

- MAGNET**, 204
 Malawi, 69, 70
 Malaya, 23
 Malaysia, 83-4
 Malcolm X, 49, 204, 205, 214, 219
 Malta, 195, 223
 Manchester, 34, 35, 99, 131, 133
 Manley, Norman, 209, 210
 Marsh, Richard, MP, 225
 Marshall Street Plan, the, 121-4
 Matabele, 59, 70
 Mason, Philip, 14
 Maternity beds, 148-9
 Mauritius, 23
 McCarren Act (1952), 32
 Mellish, R, MP, 123
 Michael X, 214
 Millar, Dr, 118
 Milner-Holland Report, 115, 116, 219
 Mississippi, 43, 48
 Mixed marriages, 15, 29, 45, 89
 Monckton Commission (1960), 74
 Montgomery, 50
 Moral standards, 87-8, 93-4, 95, 97, 147
 Movement for Colonial Freedom, 152
 Myrdal, Gunnar, 45

 proportion of, in USA, 55
 crime rate, 95-6
 and house purchase, 124
 education, 140
 Newland, Lynden, 210
 New Jersey, 46
News of the World, The, 148
 New Zealand, 22
 emigration to, 207-8
 Nicholson, Sir Godfrey, MP, 187
 Nicol, Dr W, 145
 Nigeria, 24, 36, 115, 199, 220
 Nixon, Richard, 48
 Nkomo, Joshua, 74
 Northern Rhodesia, 222
 Northwood, London, 205
 Nottingham, 34, 148, 154
 Notting Hill, 126, 154
 Nursing, immigrants in, 104
 Nyasaland, 222

OLDBURY, 213
 Orange Free State, 58
 Osborne, Sir Cyril, MP, 144, 149, 154,
 157, 186, 189
 Overseas aid, 18-19, 222-4

NATIONAL ASSISTANCE, abuses of,
 100-2
 National Association for the Advance-
 ment of Coloured People, 45-6
 National Committee for Commonwealth
 Immigrants, 196
 National Insurance, abuses of, 100, 102
 National policy, five basic principles for,
 226-7
 National Socialists (English), 171
Naughts For Your Comfort (Huddleston),
 57
 Nazi doctrine, 15, 29
 Negroes, sexual fear and, 14, 45, 46, 52
 innate inferiority, 14
 intelligence, 20
 deprived of culture, 22
 servants, 31
 in USA, 42, 43-55
 demands for equality, 45
 voting question, 47-8
 advancement of, in USA, 49, 54
 extreme claims by, 53
 still in bondage to colour, 53-4

NATIONAL ASSISTANCE, abuses of,
 100-2
 National Association for the Advance-
 ment of Coloured People, 45-6
 National Committee for Commonwealth
 Immigrants, 196
 National Insurance, abuses of, 100, 102
 National policy, five basic principles for,
 226-7
 National Socialists (English), 171
Naughts For Your Comfort (Huddleston),
 57
 Nazi doctrine, 15, 29
 Negroes, sexual fear and, 14, 45, 46, 52
 innate inferiority, 14
 intelligence, 20
 deprived of culture, 22
 servants, 31
 in USA, 42, 43-55
 demands for equality, 45
 voting question, 47-8
 advancement of, in USA, 49, 54
 extreme claims by, 53
 still in bondage to colour, 53-4

PADDINGTON, 133
 Pakistanis, distribution of, 35-6, 86
 religion, 35
 women, position of, 35-6
 numbers, 38-40
 as landlords, 86, 114-15, 117-19
 moral standards, 88, 93-4, 97
 least integrated of immigrants, 92-3,
 94
 ideal as workers, 93
 resented for strangeness and with-
 drawal, 94
 employment, 103 ff
 overcrowding, 113
 children, at school, 131 ff
 teachers, 135-9
 high incidence of tuberculosis among,
 144, 146, 150
 little interest in British politics, 213
 Pannell, Norman, MP, 154-5
Panorama, 166
 Parkin, Ben, MP, 133
People, The, 208

- People's Caretaker Council, 74
 Perceversev, Mrs C, 121
 Peterborough, 145
 Poles, 29
 Police, immigrants as, 106
 Politics, increasing activity of immigrants in, 211-17
 Portuguese, 13, 23, 25, 70, 71, 74
 Prem, Dr Dhani, 121-3
 Propaganda, 203-5
 Property, *see* Housing and Landlords
 Prostitution, 93
 Publicans, immigrants as, 106
 Public houses, discrimination in, 192-3
 Puerto Rico, 43, 130
 Punjab, 34

 RACE, definition of, 20-1
 Race prejudice, 80-3
 Race Relations Act, 189-95, 220
 author's speech on, 190-1
 Racial Adjustment Action Society, 214
 Racial clashes, universality of, 83-4
 Radio and television, in education, 141
 handling of racial questions by, 205-6
 Red Indians, 22
 Redmayne, Sir Martin, MP, 164
 Religion, 34, 91, 106, 215-16
 Renton, Sir David, MP, 101
 Repatriation, 185, 220-2
 Reporting, unfair, 54, 57-8, 170, 205-6.
 See also Propaganda
 Residents' Associations, 218-19
 Rhodes, Cecil, 69, 70, 75
 Rhodesia, population of, 69
 extent of, 69-70
 early history, 70
 land apportionment in, 70
 education, 70
 1961 Constitution, 71, 75
 franchise, 71-2
 as a bastion against communism, 76
 need for support, of, 76-7
 Richard, Ivor, MP, 192
 Roman Empire, 12, 16
 Royle, C, MP, 157
 Russia, 16
 racial prejudice in, 81-3

 SABAH, 222
 Sandu Singh, 173

 Sandwell Youth Club, *see* Smethwick
 Sangster, Donald, 210
 Selma, Alabama, 48, 50, 51, 54
 Sexual promiscuity, 88, 90, 95, 147
 Sheffield, 34
 Shelton, Robert, 50
 Shucy, A M, 20
 Shuttleworth, Alan, 159
 Sikhs, 34, 86, 95, 120, 134, 170, 173
 Silverman, Julius, MP, 153
 Sithole, Reverend, 74
 Slave trade, 13-14, 31, 43
 Slough, 97, 118, 124
 Smallpox, 144, 145, 150
 Smethwick, coloured percentage in, 37
 Sikhs concentrated in, 86, 120, 134
 West Indian 'party' held in, 90
 social life for immigrants in, 95, 120
 crime, 97, 101
 Marshall Street, 101, 121-3, 127, 218
 cost of immigrant services, 108-9
 strike over immigrant workers in, 110
 housing problems in, 115, 116, 121-8, 162
 education in, 130-4, 138
 Sandwell Youth Club, 141-2, 218
 typhoid outbreak (1965), 144
 tuberculosis, in, 145
 birth control film, 147
 hospital confinement pressure, 149
 Conservative Party in, 154, 162, 164
 and immigration control, 155, 158, 161
 Harold Wilson's visit to, 160
 extent and history of, 162
 political control in, 162
 start of racial troubles in, 162
 no colour prejudice in, 163
 1964 Election, 167-77, 203
 repatriation suggestion originated in, 185
 test cases for Racial Relations Act in, 193-4
 bomb outrage in, 206
 immigrants' political activities in, 212-15
 Smethwick Telephone, 164
 Smith, Ian, 72-4
 Smith, John Douglas, 73
 Socialist Commentary, 132
 Socialist Standard, 208
 Soskice, Sir Frank, MP, 225

INDEX

- South Africa, 55-68, 74
 trade and industry in, 56-7
 history of, 58 ff
 population, 59-60
 slum clearance, 64
 Welkom hospital, 64
 education, 65
 self-government for Coloureds in, 66
 need for goodwill towards, 67-8
 see also Apartheid
 Southall, 86, 120, 124, 133, 208, 212,
 217, 219
 Southern African Freedom Group, 153
 Southwark, Bishop of, 175
 Spain, 13, 23
Spectator, The, 177
 Springett, Dr V H, 145
Star (Jamaica), 204
 Stevas, Norman St John, MP, 187, 189,
 195
 Stonehouse, John, MP, 153
 Sussex Racial Preservation Society, 218
 Surinam, 80
 Switzerland, immigration in, 80-1, 198
- TAMILNAD, 34
 Tanzania, 24
 Teachers, immigrant, *see* Education
Testing of Negro Intelligence, The (Shuey),
 20
 Thomas, Luther, 121, 170
 Thorneycroft, Peter, MP, 83, 88
 Thurmond, Senator Strom, 46
Time and Tide, 146
Times, The, 41, 167, 206
 Tobago, 210
 Toilet facilities, misuse of, 106
 Toolen, Archbishop Thomas, 51
 Tories, *see* Conservative Party
 Trinidad, 23, 105, 210
 Tuberculosis, 144, 145, 146, 150, 151
 Typhoid, 144, 150
- UGANDA, 23, 222
 Ukrainians, 29
Unarmed Invasion, The (Elton), 100
 Unemployment benefit, *see* National In-
 surance
 United States of America, 42-55, 140,
 203
- Deep South, 19, 44, 47-51, 140
 restricts immigration, 32
 colour policies in, 43, 46, 55
 legislation against miscegenation, 45
 resistance to equality, 45
 violence in, 46-7, 49-50, 52
 votes, 47
 social contacts, reduction in, between
 races, 49
 unfair reporting in, 54
 Negro crime rate, 95-6
 Negro house purchasing, 124
 Negro education, 140
 citizenship tests in, 203
- VENEREAL DISEASE, 146-7, 150
 Vickers, Dame Joan, MP, 187
 Vote, right to, 203
 Voting Rights Bill (USA), 48
 Vouchers, 155, 160-1, 195
- WALKER, PATRICK GORDON, and
 Commonwealth Immigrants Bill,
 156-7, 160
 relations with Smethwick people,
 163-4
 in 1964 Election, 166-8, 170-5
 defeated, 175, 181
 Walsall, 134, 136
 Walthamstow, 134, 146
 Warrington, 145
 Wcale, P, 62
 Webb, Reverend J B, 65
 Wednesbury, Staffordshire, 94, 113
 Wells, John, MP, 164
 West Bromwich, 133, 193
*West Indian Gazette and Afro-Asian
 Caribbean News*, 204-5
 West Indian National Association, 213
 West Indians, start of immigration, 31-4
 cultures of, 33
 distribution of, 34, 37, 86
 numbers, 38-40
 settling in, 85-6
 purchase of goods by, 86, 111
 juvenile delinquency among, 90
 religion, 91
 love of ostentation, 95
 sexual promiscuity of, 95, 147
 drug trafficking among, 96-7

INDEX

- moral standards, disregard of, 97
- abuse of Assistance by, 101-2
- employment, 103 ff
- women, as workers, 110
- as tenants, 114 ff
- cleanliness, in houses, 126
- typhoid outbreak among (1965),
144-5
- high illegitimacy rate, 147
- high birth rate, 148
- emigration to Africa suggested, 209
- little interest in politics among,
213-14
- increasing truculence of leaders, 216
- West Indian Unity Association, 121,
170, 174, 213, 214, 218
- West Riding, 133-4
- White, Walter, 46
- White Paper on Immigration (1965)
196-7, 216
- White supremacy, doctrine of, 13, 15
- White Vigilantes, 219
- Why We Can't Wait* (Baldwin), 46
- Willesden, 149
- Williams, Alderman C V, 176
- Williams, Shirley, Mrs, MP, 186
- Wilson, Harold, MP, 160, 166, 176-7,
180, 212
- Wolverhampton, coloureds travel free in
buses, 105-6
- rioting in, 115
- 'little Harlems' risk in, 124
- tuberculosis in, 144-6
- immigrant birth rate in, 147-9
- whites will be outnumbered in parts
of, 221
- Women, immigrant, 35-6, 92, 93, 110
- XHOSA, 58, 60-2, 66
- YORKSHIRE POST, 146
- Youth Clubs, 141-3
- Youth employment, 105, 110
- ZAMBIA, 69, 70
- Zimbabwe African Union, 74
- Zulus, 59, 60, 62